

***“NAME HIM SO THAT
THE PEOPLE ARE SAVED FROM
(THE FITNAH WITHIN) HIM.”
(Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)***

NAMING AND SHAMING THE ZINDEEQS AND THE MUDHILLEEN

By:
Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
P.O. Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056

A DONKEY AND A SHAITAAN

“He who is given cause for anger, but displays no anger is a donkey.

He who is appeased, but is not pleased is a shaitaan.”

(Imaam Shaafi’ – Rahmatullah alayh)

When there exists valid Shar’i cause for anger –
Bughdh fil Laah – but a person finds no anger in his
heart, he is, at the minimum, a donkey.

And, he who refuses to accept the apology of the
repentant one is a shaitaan.

INTRODUCTION

At a recent function erroneously termed ‘walimah’, the eating arrangement was westernized. All the guests had to devour food from tables, sitting on chairs in kuffaar style. Amongst the crowd were several Molvis who flagrantly violated the Sunnah by joining with the crowd to eat from tables without any qualms.

A Brother who happens to be a Madrasah Student was also present. This Student selected to sit on the floor in one corner to eat in Sunnah style. An elder of the Tabligh Jamaat, haemorrhaging in his heart and brains with spasms of anti-Sunnah bile, could not contain his abhorrence for the sight of a Muslim eating food sitting on the floor in the style of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He felt obliged to vent his satanic emotions.

Thus, this character whose mental equilibrium was disturbed by the sight of the Sunnah deemed it appropriate to excrete a torrent of kufr thereby denigrating the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and humiliating publicly the honour of the Student who was observing the Sunnah.

The Student complained to us about the disgraceful conduct of the miserable elder of the Tabligh Jamaat. In addition to having blurted out kufr, he also sullied the name of the Tabligh Jamaat, for this chap happens to be an elder of the Jamaat.

Taking up the valid complaint of the Student, we published a comment on the episode for the edification of the miscreant and as guidance and warning to the community in general, and to the Ulama in particular – the Ulama who had been complicit with the miscreant in his kufr. They had condoned the tirade of kufr with their spectating and silence, thereby qualifying themselves for the epithet, *Dumb Devils* mentioned by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) for those who maintain silence whilst the Sunnah and the Haqq are being disgustingly trampled on.

After the publication of our comment, a miserable student molvi, with an egregiously bloated ego, having hallucinations of being a ‘mujtahid’, entered the scene with a stupid disgorgement of utterly baseless arguments - arguments which he had lapped up from the internet – in defence of the character who had denigrated the Sunnah at the mock ‘walimah’. The misguided student molvi, only succeeded to exhibit his *jahaalat* with Qur’aanic Aayaat and Ahaadith extraneous to the topic which he himself introduced in an abortive bid to defend what is indefensible in terms of the Shariah.

The misguided student molvi presented the theme of “*naming and shaming*” the subject of the discussion, but he has miserably failed to proffer even a single valid Shar’i *daleel* for his contention abortively designed to defend the anti-Sunnah Tablighi Jamaat elder. In presenting his case, the student molvi had simply executed a haphazard cut and paste job from some website. It is palpably clear that he does not understand the greater part of the Arabic references which he had cut from the internet.

Initially, it was not our intention to respond to the drivel the fellow had presented as his argument for his imagined impermissibility of naming deviates. However, another consideration constrained us to respond. This treatise is our brief response to the drivel offered by the miscreant in defence of the other miscreant who had flagrantly denigrated the Sunnah and disparaged the honour of a Muslim Brother.

The consideration which goaded us into this response is the despicable attitude of the Asaatizah of the Darul Uloom who corrupt the brains of students with gheebat of others, especially of those whom they deem to be their adversaries among the Ulama-e-Haqq. Instead of the Asaatizah being examples of Taqwa and guidance for their students, nowadays they are *mudhilleen* – *misguiders*. The *gheebat* of the Madrasah teachers breeds disrespect in students, stunts their intelligence and deprives them of *Roohaaniyat* which is a vital requisite for the acquisition of the *Noor of Ilm*.

Thus, this Response is *naseehat* for the miscreant Tablighi Jamaat elder who has lost his Imaan in consequence of his tirade of kufr. It is hoped that he will understand his villainous folly and repent. This treatise is also *naseehat* for the miscreant student molvi who had undertaken the stupid task of presenting drivel *dalaa-il* thereby exposing gross *Ilmi* deficiency. And, it is also a *naseehat* for the Asaatizah who have been entrusted with the *Amaanat* of the Talaba. The Ulama who have lost respect for the Sunnah can also derive *naseehat* from this discussion.

JUHHAAL PARADING AS ULAMA

By Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi
(Rahmatullah alayh)

**“Leave the ignoramuses (of the masses),
know with certitude that nowadays,
if not all, then at least most of the Ulama
are *jaahil*. In fact some Ulama are
greater *jaahils* than the *juhala* (among
the masses). They wander around
delivering lectures whilst they are
bereft of any semblance of Knowledge.”**

*This was the commentary of Hadhrat
Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) of the
condition of the Ulama about two centuries
ago. What should be the opinion today in
this era of fitnah, fisq and fujoor in which
the molvis are the forerunners?*

PLAGIARISM AND CHICANERY

*“Never regard those who are proud over what they
have perpetrated whilst they love to be praised for
such deeds which they did not render ---
never ever think that they will escape from the
punishment. For them there is a painful chastisement.”
(Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 188)*

Besides the specific circumstance of revelation (*Shaan-e-Nuzool*) of this Aayat, the generality (*Umoom*) of the castigation is applicable to the student molvi and to the new breed molvis of this era who are deceived by the nafsani idea of being ‘experts’ in the field of *Ilm* of the Deen.

The practice of these paper ‘experts’ is to search the internet for *tahqiq* (research). Being inept and grossly deficient in *Isti’daad*, they lack valid access to the Kutub of the Shariah, hence they resort to the impure internet media for lapping up the deficient and even corrupt *tahqeeqaat* (researches) of deviates – liberals and Salafis.

The miscreant molvi who has deemed it appropriate to open his mouth in defence of the anti-Sunnah *Zindeeq*, is one of those molvis who presents internet disgorgement as his own ‘*tahqiq*’ for which he is hopeful of praises and accolades. Goaded on by an egregiously bloated ego, he extracts on a wholesale basis just anything from the internet which he imagines will vindicate his corrupt stance.

Instead of researching the Kutub and citing therefrom, the miscreant exhibits his extreme paucity of valid Kutub references, hence his information is gleaned primarily from websites. That is why he has been capable of displaying hideous audacity by refuting the official and authoritative Tafseer of Qur'aanic aayaat, which has come down to us the long passage of 14 centuries. Just imagine the gross *jahaalat*, to say the least, of this upstart paper 'mujtahid' who avers that the Tafseer which has been recorded since the past fourteen centuries, and narrated by all the illustrious Mufasssireen, **is not worthy to quote**. Perhaps he is trapped in the addiction of some substance abuse, especially the substance of *inordinate ujub and takabbur of the nafs*.

He cites lengthy texts acquired from websites without even acknowledging the source. This is plagiarism and chicanery, and these are outstanding features of the character of the paper 'mujtahids' of this era. They steal the deficient *tahqeeqaat* of even liberals and Salafis and present it in a manner to bring them within the scope of the castigation mentioned in the aforementioned Qur'aanic Aaayat. They desire accolades and praise for their literary deception – for their deficient cut and paste jobs.

THE SUNNAH IS NOT THE HANDMAID OF KUFFAAR NORMS AND NAFSAANI DESIRES

THE BACKGROUND

The complaint of the Student who was humiliated with the tirade of kufr disgorged by the anti-Sunnah tablighi doctor, and our comment are reproduced here.

A Brother lamenting, writes:

Respected Mufti Saheb
Assalaamualaikum

I recently attended the nikah of the daughter of Dr Mubeen who is a prominent member and an old worker at the Johannesburg Markaz of the Tabligh Jamaat. He is originally from Pakistan and he is part of the Shura committee. After the nikah I attended the dawat hosted by Dr Mubeen. There were two separate venues for ladies and men. Accordingly I thought that everything will be according to sunnat so I attended.

When I entered there I was shocked to find that only tables and chairs were set out. I asked one of the waiters if it would be possible for me to sit on the floor and if he could arrange for a table cloth. He happily obliged and gave me permission. I enjoyed the meal and no one prevented me. I noticed Dr Mubeen going from table to table attending to everybody, but it seemed as if he was purposely ignoring me. Since we are

quite close I assumed that this thought was just from shaytaan. I did not see anybody else sitting on the floor. At the nikah ceremony I noticed that many famous Ulema from the tabligh jamaat and major Darul Uloom had attended. Some people were pointing fingers at me, nevertheless I was happy and didn't think anything at that time. I met the grooms brother at the dawat, he was an old school friend of mine, he was overjoyed to see me sitting the sunnah way.

On Sunday I attended the Walima. This time I took my dastarkhan with me so as not to cause takleef. I arrived early and I was happy to meet my old school friend outside who is the groom's brother who was hosting the Walima. I told him "You know how I sit and eat, can I bring my dastarkhaan?" He gave full permission and later even helped me to find a place to sit which was completely out of the way. It was still early and after I laid down my dastarkhaan I noticed that Dr Mubeen had entered and people were going to greet him.

I got up and made my way to him to greet him. He looked at my Dastarkhaan and caught my arm. He said, "I wanted to tell you on Friday when I saw you, that this what you are doing is very wrong. You cannot sit on the floor here. There is a time and place for everything, and this is not the place to do this Sunnat."

I tried to calm him down by saying that this is my habit and that I am not comfortable with sitting at a table. Before I could finish my sentence he cut me off by nodding his head as if he was disappointed and said, "No no no, there are big big Ulama here. You are insulting them, you are insulting our guests and our hosts by doing this here. We even eat on the

floor at home, but here we don't do this. This is not the place. This is why you must come in Tableegh Jamaat, we will teach you how to practice on the Sunnat. There are great great Ulama here. Who are you? (He was quite loud at this point and I could see another uncle to the left of me shaking his head in agreement as if to spur him on.) You are a small person. You are nothing compared to them. You come here and insult everybody. How can you go and sit like this here? In fact, I want you to come and sit next to me (at a table), you are our Sher (lion), our tiger (he said this as if to apply Vaseline to my wounded heart.) You must come and sit next to me." I was almost in tears at this point.

I went to my father and asked him to have a word with him outside. I told him that I am not used to sitting at a table. In fact, when I stayed at hotels during safar (journey), they obliged to reserve a special section for me to sit on the floor. This was a Walimah. A Sunnah of our Nabi (Sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). I was heartbroken and confused. My house was a walking distance of 10-15 minutes away. I walked home and warmed up some leftover food and ate it alone at home.

When my mother came home she had found out and asked me why did I not eat. I told her what had happened. She was very emotional. My mother went to visit Dr Mubeen's wife (who is her very close friend) a few days later to thank her. She was happy that I was sitting on the floor and enquired if I had eaten well. My mother informed her of what transpired at the Walima and that I had not eaten. Upon hearing this his wife started crying.

Question: What I would like to know is that we often hear the Jamaat brothers announce in the Masjid, “My success, your success and the success of the entire mankind lies in Deen. Deen is to obey the Commands of Allah Ta’ala **as shown to us by Nabi (Sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)**. For this to come into our lives a definite effort is required...,” thus I have understood that success lies in following Nabi (Sallallahu alaihi wasallam), and Nabi (Sallallahu alaihi wasallam) never ever sat at a table and ate even though others sat at tables. Therefore I have tried to implement this in my life with my best efforts. I understand and accept that I am a small person and I don’t know everything, that is why I am enquiring, is the Sunnat implemented only at certain times and at certain places or do we abandon the Sunnat when big and great Ulama abandon it in the eye of the public? Do we blindly follow them (the big and great Ulama) when the Sunnat can be implemented? Maybe it is the fault of the host for not providing suitable facilities to eat on the floor and this is why the Ulama are mazoor?

(End of the Brother’s lament.)

COMMENT

Brother, firstly, you have to be reprimanded for your attendance of a function organized in kuffaar style. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“It is not proper for a Mu’min to bring disgrace on himself.”

You were humiliated the first occasion when you attended the haraam wedding reception, and along with your humiliation,

the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was humiliated with kufr *tahqeer* (the attitude of contempt). Then despite having been publicly humiliated you went into the very same pit of disgrace by attending the so-called ‘walimah’ where you were humiliated to a greater degree. It is mentioned in the Hadith that a Mu’min is not bitten twice from the same hole. Your error was to have attended the anti-Sunnah, haraam functions.

Needless to say, the attitude of the host was kufr. He mocked and held in contempt the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Sunnah is meant for all time right until the Day of Qiyaamah.

The ‘great’ ulama present were members of the fraternity of ulama-e-soo’. Only such vile ‘ulama’ bereft of genuine love for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are capable of tolerating the flagrantly kufr attitude of the host. Only the evil ulama compromise and abandon the Sunnah and the Haqq in the public domain and tolerate contempt hurled on the Sunnah.

The averment of the host, that the so-called ‘walimah’ was not the venue for the Sunnah but the Tablighi Jamaat Ijtimah tent is the proper venue for the Sunnah is a portrayal of his nifaaq. The Qur’aan Majeed says about those who practise double standards with the Deen: *“They speak with their tongues what is not in their hearts.”*

One who has honour for the Sunnah, will never conduct himself so despicably as the host had acquitted himself, showing scorn for the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi

wasallam). That the Sunnah is to be staunchly upheld at all times and in all places is vividly demonstrated by the attitude of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu). A group of Sahaabah was invited for meals by the Christian king of Irbal. The food was spread on the ground.

Whilst eating, a morsel of food slipped from the hand of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu). And it fell on the ground. He promptly picked it up and as he was about to eat it, a Muslim sitting next to him whispered to him not to eat it in the presence of the king and his royal retinue. They were looking on and would gain a bad impression of the Muslims.

Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu), loudly exclaimed for all to hear: ***“Should I abandon the Sunnah of my Beloved for the sake of these ignoramuses?”*** Then he proceeded to consume the morsel. The host of the brother who was affronted by the brother’s insistence to observe the Sunnah is not only among the *Humakaa’ (ignoramuses)*, he in fact is guilty of kufr. The Christian king and his noblemen did not comment adversely on the Sunnah. They were silent, yet Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) labelled them *Humaqaa’*. Now what label should be attached to this miserable host who pretends to be a Tablighi but despises the Sunnah?

The refrain, *“My success, your success and the success of entire mankind lies in the Deen.....”* which is the opening statement in the announcements of the Tablighi brothers, by far and large has become an empty, hollow monotonous cliché. The host who is a prominent member of the Tablighi Jamaat has demonstrated practically the hollowness of this

cliché. The vast majority of them is shockingly ignorant of the Sunnah. For them the Sunnah is confined to the turban, kurtah, beard and miswaak. Most of them have even discarded the Waajib Sunnah of the pants above the ankles. They have discarded the Wajib Sunnah of the Sunnah Salaat after the Fardh. They accord priority to their bayaan and relegate the Sunnah Salaat to the background. Their muaasharaat (social dealings) are rotten as the host has demonstrated with his reaction to the brother seated on the ground.

The Sunnah for them is a hobby to be practised at convenience, and to project a face of piety and holiness. It has no real meaning in practical life. They speak of ‘definite effort’. This has become a comical cliché because there is no ‘definite’ effort for the Deen in the lives of the majority of the Tabligh Jamaat members. ‘Definite effort’ is the effort of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) and of the Sahaabah (Radhiyallahu anhum).

The implementation of the Sunnah has uniform application. It is not a haphazard culture of convenience and expedience. It is not the handmaid of desire, fashion, style, least of all of *Tashabbuh bil kuffaar*, and that is exactly what eating from tables and sitting on chairs for meals means.

The errors and sins of ‘great’ ulama may not be followed. Following the errors and sins of ‘great’ ulama was the practice of Bani Israaeel, hence, the Qur’aan reprimands: *“They take their ahbaar (molvis and sheikhs – their ‘great’ ulama) and their ruhbaan (their khaanqah sheikhs) as gods besides Allah.....”*

About the errors and obscurities of the ‘great’ Ulama, Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha’raani (Rahmatullah alayh) said: *“He who clings to the rarities (errors, obscurities and diversionary views) of the Ulama, verily he has made his exit from Islam.”* The weaknesses, compromises and spinelessness of the ‘great’ ulama who had ate at the tables are never *daleel* for the expungement of the Sunnah. Their deficiencies are not a basis for treating the Sunnah like a hobby or a handmaid to come forward at beck and call.

This should never be the style of this Ummah. Unfortunately, it has become the style of the Muslim masses to follow the sinful deeds of the miscreant ‘great’ ulama simply because such following is appealing to the bestial nafs.

The ulama are never ‘*ma’zoor*’ for commission of haraam as the brother surmises. They are culpable and complicit in killing the Sunnah by their active connivance and support of the miscreant host.

We are living in the era in which the ulama-e-soo’ abound. The Deen has become forlorn and friendless as Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Islam began ghareeb (forlorn and friendless). Soon shall it return to that ghareeb state as it had begun. Congratulations to the Ghuraba (the forlorn ones who struggle to uphold the Sunnah).”

NAMING AND SHAMING THE ZINDEEQS AND THE MUDHILLEEN – RESURRECTING A VITAL SUNNAH

The problem with the student who wrote the article is that he is a bit too big for his boots. He thinks of himself as being a ‘mujtahid’, hence he cites Qur’aanic aayaat and Ahaadith at random and subjects these to his personal opinion to fabricate what he hallucinates is the law. The problem of all sciolists – those with a smattering of knowledge – is that they suffer from *ujub*, hence to proffer an image of scholarship they simply darken pages with Qur’aanic verses and Ahaadith which are totally unrelated to the topic of discussion.

This student’s knowledge is extremely deficient and constricted. He cites randomly without understanding what the issue is. When it is said that pork is haraam, he seeks to prove the ‘*hillat*’ of pork with *dalaa-il* proving the *hillat* of mutton. He argues exactly in the same style and fashion as the mob of *ulama-e-soo*’. We can see that he is firmly set on following the path of the *ulama-e-soo*’.

Between the *riwaqyaat* pertaining to persons who sinned in privacy and the specific episode of the denigrator of the Sunnah in public, there is absolutely no correlation. The student has failed to discern and understand the fundamental difference between the two different scenarios. Since he has miserably failed to understand the difference, all his *dalaa-il* are flotsam in relation to the subject matter under discussion.

He subconsciously desires to acquit himself as a ‘mujtahid’, yet he fails to understand the difference between a person who sins in privacy and a person who audaciously scorns the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasllam) in the public domain. He lacks the intellectual ability to distinguish between a simple sinner who commits a sin and a veritable *mudhil* who commits *Istikhfaaf* of the Sunnah in the public.

The miscreant student, with the examples he presents, rebuts his own ‘naming and shaming’ concept which he monotonously ingeminates. The gravamen of his insipid and baseless article is that a culprit should not be named and shamed. This is like saying that a person should not be killed. Killing is valid and even Waajib for a Shar’i reason. In many cases, killing is an ibaadat. It is moronic to contend that in all cases naming and shaming are not permissible. The *mudhil* who pillages the Imaan of the *awaam* (public) has to be compulsorily named and shamed. The robber who waylays people and loots their property must be named and shamed. The serial rapists must be named and shamed. Where the objective of naming and shaming is the protection of the Imaan, morals, life and property of people, then such naming and shaming become Waajib. In fact, naming and shaming is a Sunnah which the Ulama have abandoned in almost entirety.

Besides numerous practical examples of naming and shaming in the interests of Imaan and Islam to be found in the Kutub of the Shariah, there is explicit *Nass* for the ibaadat of naming and shaming. This ibaadat in which the Muhadditheen excelled should be sufficient for demolishing the baseless contention of the student. The chap seems to be

ignorant of the science of *Jarah and Ta'deel* which literally is the act of naming and shaming to safeguard the Deen and to save the Imaan of Muslims, and to save them from being ensnared into the meshes of the shaitani trap.

The worst epithets of naming and shaming emblazon the science of *Jarah-Ta'deel*. The issue here is not the motive. What is under scrutiny is the act of naming a deviate. As long as the niyyat is Islamically valid, the naming of the deviate, shaitaan and the donkey will be laudable and even incumbent as an effect of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*. The science of Criticizing and Assessing the characters of the narrators, is the weakest branch of Islamic Knowledge. It is most confusing and even weird. The contradictions are bewildering. Nevertheless, despite the flimsy foundation of this branch of Knowledge, the Muhadditheen are not castigated for employing the worst of pejorative, in fact scandalous epithets for assailing, naming, shaming and condemning a narrator. On the contrary, the disparaging of the honour of narrators is validly justified for the protection of the Imaan of the masses and for guarding the purity of the Deen.

Commenting on this weird, but valid branch of Knowledge, Allaamah Aini (Rahmatullah alayh) says:

“He who has a panoptical gaze on the kutub of Asmaaur Rijal will discover bewildering wonders therein. He will find that some Raawi (Narrator) who is among the Pillars of the Deen against whom there is an abundance of criticism. You will find in the kutub of Asmaaur Rijal that he is depicted as a destroyer of the Deen, and in the Ummah he is portrayed as if he is like Abdullah Bin Saba' in the plot to deracinate Islam. On the other hand among the Ruwaat will be

found an enemy of the Deen from the extremist Mu'tazilis and the perpetrators of Tashayyu' and Rifdh (Shi'ism) and evil bid'ah. However, despite all of this the Muhadditheen had authenticated his narrations."

(Nukhabul Afkaar Sharh Ma-aanil Aathaar—Imaam Badruddin Al-Aini)

Naming the Tablighi doctor who had acquitted himself disgustingly in the public by belittling and scorning the Sunnah, is not different from a Muhaddith labelling a Raawi as 'Kath-thaab', Shaitaan, Dajjaal, Himaar (Donkey), etc. Naming the narrator with the designations of liar, fraudster, fabricator, etc. is for the sake of the Deen of the people. Similarly, naming the *gustaakh* doctor who shamelessly denigrated the Sunnah is in the interests of the Deen. The one who insults the Sunnah is not only a *mudhil*. He hovers on the brink of *irtidaad*. He should renew his Kalimah and Nikah. He has to make Taubah.

Whilst this misguided moron student takes umbrage because the critic of the Sunnah was named, he remains blind to the fact that Rasulullah's Sunnah was publicly and audaciously assailed. He is not concerned with the fact that the Sunnah was scorned. He is concerned with the vindication of the culprit who had publicly insulted the Sunnah. He should examine his Imaan. He is hurt because the criminal was named, and he audaciously comes out in support of the *gustaakh*, but he is not hurt at the insult of the Sunnah. Something is amiss with this chap's Imaan. He should engage in *Muraaqabah* and *Muhaasabah* to detect and apprehend the thief lurking in his heart. It is ironic that

the fellow who has scrounged from the internet random citations from the Qur'aan and Ahaadith lacks sufficient love for the Sunnah.

With considerable puerility, the student says: "*The Qur'aan did not mention the names of all the deviates.*" Firstly, by implication he concedes that the names of some deviates were mentioned, hence he says: '*all the deviates*'. The mention of some names suffices for the correctness of our stance. Secondly, his 'ijtihad' is corrupt. Abstention from mentioning the names in the Qur'aan, may not be construed as a prohibition. The Qur'aan abstains from mentioning even the five Fardh Salaat, the raka'ts and thousands of imperative masaa-il. In this averment this fellow is emulating the modernist *zanaadaqah* who have the satanic penchant of rejecting the Ahkaam on the basis of the fallacy that such ahkaam are not in the Qur'aan. His argument here is plain stupidity and fallacious.

On the basis of his stupid 'ijtihad', the student avers: "*The methodology of the Qur'an is to impart lessons, not to name and shame every single deviate.*" He cunningly leaves a window open to jump out from a predicament, hence he restricts the 'methodology', with '*not every single deviate*', which is in fact an acknowledgment that some deviates are named. Even if it be assumed or hallucinated that the Qur'aan does not mention the name of a single deviate, it will be the effect of *jahaalat* to contend that naming and shaming a *mudhil* or a *zindeeq* who poses a danger for the Imaan and Akhlaaq of Muslims, is not permissible.

This argument is like the Christian missionary's contention that 'Jesus' is superior to Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) because while Muhammad is mentioned only four times in the Qur'aan, 'Jesus' is mentioned more than 20 times. Such silly 'dalaa-il' are not befitting the Ahl-e-Ilm, especially of one who pretends to be a 'mujtahid'. Furthermore, the Qur'aan Majeed while being the primary source of the Ahkaam, is not the only source. Also, the Mufasssireen have mentioned the names of the deviates who come within the scope of the Qur'aanic Aayaat.

The objective of naming a shaitaan or an agent of shaitaan is not necessarily to shame him. In fact, it is extremely rare that the objective is to shame him. The objective in naming a *mudhil* or a *zindeeq* and the like is to save people from the *dhalaal* which the miscreant propagates. In terms of the logic of the paper 'mujtahid' it was not permissible to name and shame Gulam Ahmad Mirza, nor Maudoodi, nor Parvez, nor Sir Sayyid nor the numerous agents of Iblees whom the Akaabeer have named without the intention of shaming them. The niyyat is always to save the masses.

Since the student appears to flaunt 'ilm' by citing from his internet references unrelated matter, we advise that he should read *Faislahkun Munaathara* of Maulana Manzoor No'maani (Rahmatullah alayh) to educate himself on the issue of 'naming and shaming'. He shall see the names conspicuously spelt out to forewarn the Ummah of the *Mudhil Bid'ati*, Ahmad Raza of Bareilwi. The student should render himself a further favour by reading Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad's *Baraahin-e-Qaatiah* from which he will

gain more information about the science of naming minus the idea of shaming.

The student should edify himself with the episodes of naming and shaming which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wsallam) executed on the day of Fatah Makkah when several persons, including two women were beheaded despite offering repentance. Their crimes of having insulted Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) were considered unforgivable.

Realizing the invalidity of his ‘ijtihaadi’ half-a-leg concept of ‘naming and shaming’, he attempts to slink out from the imbroglio by saying: *“The Mufasssireem have named some of the Sahaabah (Radhiyallahu anhum) who committed errors. However, this was not done to shame them.....So these incidents cannot be cited to support the practice of naming and shaming.”* On what basis does this chap contend that we had named the *gustaakh tablighi* doctor with the intention of ‘shaming’? What is his daleel for this slander? Did he receive perhaps *wahi* or *kashf* or *ilhaam* to confirm his hallucination that the intention underlying our mention of the miscreant tablighi doctor was to ‘shame’ him? The irrefutable fact which he reluctantly concedes is that the Mufasssireen did adopt the practice of naming. They did not name just ‘some’. They adopted this practice in every case if the name was known.

Furthermore, from whence did he scrounge the fact that we had supported any of our naming exercises with the incidents he has mentioned? This fellow revels in imagination, hence he has hallucinated that the basis for naming the character

who had insulted the Sunnah with his attitude of *istikhfaaf* and rejection, was the incidents of Sahaabah errors mentioned by the Mufasssireen. His conclusion is stupid and baseless. We did not attempt to emulate the Mufasssireen in naming and damning the denigrator of the Sunnah. We merely discharged the duty of *Amr Bil Ma'roof*, and the manner of our acquittal is perfectly permissible.

The miscreant student mentions some episodes of Sahaabah who had erred and were forgiven and honoured. It is necessary that this chap, if he has completed his stint at a Madrasah, should return and spend more time in *mutaalah* under supervision of Ustaadhs to learn the correct mode of intellectual application. Currently he misapplies his brains to stumble on stupid, irrelevant and baseless conclusions. What relationship does he discern between the honourable Sahaabah and the deviate tablighi doctor who scorned the Sunnah? Did these Sahaabah whom the Mufasssireen had named for their errors, criticize the Sunnah? Did any of them treat the Sunnah with the attitude of *Istikhfaaf and Istihzaa* ? Their errors were plain human errors which cannot be classified as acts of *dhalaal* enacted to mislead and misguide. Nevertheless, despite their errors not being any where near to the kufr uttered by the tablighi doctor, they were still named. Even from this angle, there is greater justification to name the one who denigrated the Sunnah.

The procrastination of the three Sahaabah who had lagged behind on the occasion of the Jihad campaign was not an act calculated to scorn or belittle any Sunnah. They had committed an error of judgment for which they were loudly

named and severely **shamed** to the extent that the punishment proscribed contact with even their wives. It is a classical example of valid naming and shaming for a personal error of judgment which was, in the circumstances, unforgivable without the application of the prior punishment of naming and shaming. They were subjected to great stress and grief by the process of naming and shaming which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had imposed on them. The student who has grown a bit big for his boots should reflect on this episode which he himself has cited as ‘daleel’. His reflection, if sincere, will convince him of the apodallic nature of his stupid and baseless daleel which he has presented in vindication of the culprit who had denigrated and belittled the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in public. The tablighi doctor had verbally and practically disparaged and scorned the Sunnah.

The irony of the matter is that whilst this student vindicates the doctor on the basis of his hallucination of the prohibition of even valid naming and shaming, he recedes into silence regarding the haraam naming and shaming practised by the vile tablighi doctor when he saw the brother sitting on the ground to eat in Sunnah style. In the presence of the crowd, the miscreant doctor insulted and belittled the brother who had not even ventured to offer naseehat on the haraam practice of devouring food like the kuffaar from tables and sitting on chairs. Why does this unfortunate student have no words of advice and criticism for the tablighi doctor who had terribly shamed the brother who was sitting on the ground? Why does this chap not compile an article for the edification of the doctor who had scorned and belittled the Sunnah, then

compounded his major sin by disgustingly shaming the brother? The hollowness of the ‘ilm’ and the corruption of the niyyat of this student are quite palpable from his attitude of defending the denigrator of the Sunnah and shaming and castigating the upholder of the Sunnah. He should check his Imaan. He is on the path of *zanaadaqah*.

Perhaps he is aware of the episode of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) who had picked up a morsel of food which had slipped from his hand onto the ground. When he was about to eat it after picking it up, he was advised by a companion to refrain from this action since it will bring them in disrepute in the eyes of the Christian king of Irbal and his courtiers who were all present at the meal. The vociferous response of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) was: “*Should I abandon the Sunnah of my Beloved for the sake of these ignoramuses (humaqaa’)?*”

This was the attitude of the Sahaabah towards the Sunnah of the Beloved (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But this wayward student cannot find space in his heart to defend this Sunnah. On the contrary, he has abundant energy, time and fervour to darken many pages with legless and fallacious ‘dalaa-il’ to defend the one who insulted the Sunnah, and to criticize the one who upheld the Sunnah. Something is drastically wrong with the thinking of this chap. He is in fact joining the camp of the *Mudhilleen*.

What is conspicuously established by the episode of procrastination of the three Sahaabah which he himself has cited, is the validity of naming and shaming when this

becomes imperative for the sake of Allah Ta'ala, for the sake of the Deen and for protecting the masses from the *dhalaalah* of the *zanaadaqah* and the denigrators of the Sunnah. This naming and shaming are substantiated by the explicit *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith which shall be presented further on in this discussion, Insha-Allah.

Then the fellow cites the incident of Hadhrat Maa-iz (Radhiyallahu anhu) on whom the *Hadd of Rajm* was executed. What resemblance or relationship is there between this episode and the deliberate insulting and denigration of Rasulullah's practice of eating on the ground? What basis is there in the episode of this Sahaabi for contending that it was improper to name the insulter of the Sunnah?

Furthermore, the chap is too dim to understand that despite the fact that Hadhrat Maaiz (Radhiyallahu anhyu) had not insulted the Sunnah, but had fallen victim to the nafs in a private act of sin which he himself confessed to, he was publicly named and shamed. That being publicly executed by means of *Rajm* for the heinous sin of zina is in fact a terrible act of naming and shaming, is undeniable. The shame was so much emphasized that it constrained Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to caution and warn the Sahaabah to desist from defaming and perpetuating the shaming. Nevertheless, even this private sin which had absolutely no aspect of *dhalaalah*, was considered valid for naming and shaming.

To remove the cobwebs which are stagnating the thinking process of this student, we re-iterate that none of these

episodes have been proffered as the basis for naming the miscreant, vile tablighi doctor who has insulted the Sunnah and who to this day remains unrepentant in his act of kufr.

The student then stupidly avers:

“Furthermore, the munafiqin in the time of Rasulullah were kuffar, They were munafiqin in belief, not just in practice., They had no Iman in them. They had no honour. So naming and shaming them is not a problem. But to name and shame Muslims who we consider deviates is a totally different practice.”

The Mufasssireen did name those who had Imaan in them. The Ulama of the Salaf did label severely those who had Imaan in them, and on issues unrelated to Aqeedah as shall be shown later, Insha-Allah.

This fellow is ignorant. He just does not understand the drivel he blurts out. Firstly, it was not the practice to name and shame even the munaafiqeen, hence Hadhrat Huzaifah is designated as *Saahib-e-Sirr*. Whilst he was aware of the names of all the munaafiqeen, the senior Sahaabah such as even Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) were unaware. Their names were kept secret subject to Divine Command and Wisdom. While sincere Sahaabah were named and shamed for their misdeeds and errors of judgment, the vast majority of munaafiqeen was spared the disgrace of naming and shaming them. This illogical command may not be cited in substantiation of the baseless theory spawned by the paper ‘mujtahid’. If there had been no problem in naming and

shaming munaafiqeen, their names would not have been held in secret by command of Allah Ta'ala.

Furthermore, there is the grave probability of hidden *nifaaq* lurking in the heart of one who denigrates the Sunnah or treats the Sunnah with an attitude of *Istikhfaaf*. The tablighi doctor should therefore beware, and the student should make him aware of this distinct probability of *nifaaq* which may have been the springboard for his tirade against the Sunnah.

Once the Khalifah Haroun Rashid slipped incognito in the Hadith dars of the Muhaddith Yahyah Bin Ma-een. The Muhaddith recited the Hadith: "*Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) loved dubbaa' (marrow).*" Someone from the gathering commented: "*I don't love dubbaa.*" The Khalifah was unable to restrain his rage at what he understood as the denigration of the Sunnah. He revealed himself and vociferously and repeatedly said: "*The leather and the sword! The leather and the sword! The zindeeq is denigrating the Hadith of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).*" It was only the pleading of the Muhaddith which saved the life of the commentator. This upstart paper 'mujtahid' should understand that denigrating the Sunnah is not an insignificant issue, and that defending the one who insults the Sunnah makes him complicit with the insulter in the act of denigrating the Sunnah.

The student stupidly avers: "*Another significant reason why the Mufasssireen mentioned the names of the munafiqin and some of the Sahaabah Radhiyallu anhum who erred was to*

protect the honour of the other Sahaabah Radhiyallahu anhum.”

In this statement the fellow concedes the validity of naming persons. The rationale for such naming according to him was to protect the honour of other Sahaabah. Regardless of the rationale, the validity of naming is established. As for the rationale, what is his daleel for claiming or believing that our motive was malafide? Did he receive wahi? We state with emphasis that our motive in naming the culprit tablighi doctor was to protect the honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sunnah. The criminal who had flagitiously insulted the Sunnah is solely the cause of bringing shame on himself. There was an imperative need and obligation to name the miscreant regardless of the concomitant shame which accompanied the naming motivated by the desire to vindicate the Sunnah.

The miscreant student says: *“Had the Mufasssireen not done what they had, the Shiah would have accused the other Sahabah Radhiyallahu anhum unjustly.”*

We too say that had we not done what we had, then denigration of the Sunnah and abandoning the Sunnah would become accepted as valid. Firstly, the Shiah still accuse, slander and vilify almost all the Sahaabah unjustly to this day. This statement is irrelevant to the topic of discussion. The act of naming by the Mufasssireen did not prevent the Shiah from their kufr and slander. The naming by the Mufasssireen was simply the recording of historical data for better comprehension of the Qur’aanic aayaat. Furthermore, the attitude of the Mufasssireen substantiates our practice of

naming. The Mufasssireen had their reasons and we have our reasons which are valid in terms of the Shariah.

The student has attempted a moronic dismissal of the tafseer of the aayat pertaining to the episode of Hadhrat Walid Bin Uqbah (Radhiyallahu anhu). In fact, this student appears to be a moron, hence he dismally and moronically and abortively labours to rubbish the tafseer which the Mufasssireen proffer of Aayat 6 of Surah Hujuraat. At least we have the certitude that the Mufasssireen were not paper ‘mujtahids’ such as this upstart student. His attempt to dismiss authoritative tafseer of the Aayat by acquitting himself as an ‘expert’ of Hadith is downright stupid and conceited.

He seeks to condemn the tafseer by reference to the *Isnaad*. Should we embark on the rubbish of his expertise in the sphere of Usool-e-Hadith, this brief refutation will develop into a voluminous treatise. But for the present we do not deem it worthy to embark on such a venture for the dismissal of the drivel of the paper ‘mujtahid’.

Furthermore, the mention of this Aayat by this fellow is a stupid superfluity which neither supports his contention nor our stance because the Aayat does not name any specific person. However, fearing that we may derive support from the explicit mention of the name of the Sahaabi by the Mufasssireen, the fellow deemed it expedient to preempt us, just in case we do cite the tafseer of this Aayat which in fact was the furthest from our minds.

That the Qur'aan in this aayat describes Hadhrat Walid Bin Utbah (Radhiyallahu anhu) as a 'faasiq' according to the Mufasssireen, is not cause for consternation. The Speaker is Allah Azza Wa Jal. He has all the authority to address His makhlooq as He deems appropriate. Allah Ta'ala explicitly said to Nabi Nooh (Alayhis salaam): "*Do not be among the jaahileen.*" He was among the great Ambiya. He was not a *jaahil*. He was specifically selected by Allah Azza Wa Jal to be a great Nabi. The idea of Hadhrat Nooh (Alayhis salaam) being among the *jaahileen* or becoming among them was *Mahaal-e-Aadi (practically impossible)*. Despite this reality, Allah Azza Wa Jal addressed Nabi Nooh (Alayhis salaam) in the manner in which He deemed proper, and no one has the right to open his mouth to vent any doubt whatsoever in the integrity of this great Nabi. Similarly, the Qur'aanic designation of '*faasiq*' which by implication was a reference to Hadhrat Walid Bin Uqbah (Radhiyalahu anhu) does not entitle anyone to label him a faasiq.

The Mufasssireen mentioned the episode not to predicate *fisq* for Hadhrat Walid (Radhiyallahu anhu). The episode was cited as the *Shaan-e-Nuzool* of the Aayat. In addition, it will be salutary for the paper 'mujtahid' to understand that the Qur'aanic Aayaat are timeless for application. A principle which is applicable to all times until Qiyaamah is evolved on the basis of the generality of the Aayat whose purport is not story-telling. The aayat was never meant to confirm *fisq* for Hadhrat Walid Bin Utbah (Radhiyallahu anhu).

The Qur'aan Majeed reprimands Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with severity in several places. It is the

Khaaliq speaking to and about His makhlooq. These Divine Reprimands do not detract one iota from the dignity and lofty status of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The attempt to dismiss the tafseer of the authoritative Mufasssireen who named the august personalities who were criticized by Allah Azza Wa Jal for their errors, simply displays the *jahaalat* of the student who bites off more than what he is able to chew.

Tripping over his own stupidity and damning his own theory of naming and shaming, the paper ‘mujtahid’ seeking support from authorities cites Ibn Hajar who says: “....*al-Kalbi, regarding whom Ibn Hajar said: ‘ He is regarded as one of the Shiah of Kufah. There were two liars in Kufah, one of whom was al-Kalbi, and the other was al-Suddi.*”

We think that this paper ‘mijtahid’ should apply his silly naming and shaming principle uniformly and desist from the application of double standards. Did Ibn Hajar not name and shame the two ‘liars of Kufah’? What was the need to name and shame them? Why did Ibn Hajar not adopt the principle which this miscreant paper ‘mujtahid’ has evolved? Why did Ibn Hajar flout the naseehat of the Qur’aan and Hadith by naming and shaming the two?

Since there was an imperative need to name and shame the deviates in order to save people from misguidance, Ibn Hajar merely discharged an obligation, and so did we when the miscreant tabighi doctor was named. As for the aspect of ‘shame’, he had brought shame upon himself by his public outburst against the Sunnah of Raslullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The fact that Ibn Hajar had named and shamed

the two narrators with insulting epithets, is support for our stance, not for the moron paper ‘mujtahid’ who contends that it is not permissible to name and shame deviates.

The moron advertising his *jahaalat*, avers: “*Just consider, you actually believed that a Sahaabi Radhiyallahu anhu was called a fasiq in the Qur’an. Imagine how dangerous this is for our Iman!*”

Jahaalat is dangerous. Who committed this ‘danger’ mentioned by the miscreant? All the Mufasssirreen from the era of the Sahaabah to this day should be accused of having committed “something dangerous for their Imaan”. This is precisely what the moron implies with his comment. To name the Sahaabi in the context of the Aayat is “*something dangerous for our Imaan*” says the miscreant student. But no one besides the illustrious Mufasssireen and the Ulama of the Salaf had sustained the mention of the Sahaabi’s name in the context of the Aayat. He fails to understand that he has cast grave aspersions of the Imaan of the Salafus Saaliheen with his statement uttered without application of the mind.

There is not a single Mu’min whose Imaan is secure who will venture the thought of the Sahaabi being a faasiq since Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) had said that all his Sahaabah are *Udool*. There is not a single Mu’min whose brains have not become convoluted with kufr ideologies who will ever think that Nabi Nooh (Alayhis salaam) was among the ‘*jaahileen*’, despite this explicit mention in the Qur’aan.

Admonishing Nabi Daawood (Alayhis salaam), Allah Ta'ala says: *“O Daawood! Verily, We have made you the Khalifah on earth, therefore adjudicate between people with the Haqq and do not follow vain desire, for then it will mislead you from the Path of Allah. Verily, those who stray from the Path of Allah, for them there is a severe punishment because they forgot the Day of Reckoning.”*

Can any Mu'min believe that this great Nabi chosen by Allah Ta'ala Himself will follow his vain desires, adjudicate unjustly and stray from the Path of Allah because he had forgotten the Day of Qiyaamah? Anyone who ventured such kufr, was threatened with a 100 lashes by Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu). Despite this, Allah Azza Wa Jal addressed His Nabi in this manner. It was the address of Khaaliq to His makhlooq.

Cautioning Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Allah Ta'ala says: *“Do not divert your eyes from them (the Fuqara) intending the adornment of this worldly life, and do not follow the one whose heart We have made forgetful of Our Thikr...”*

Does any Mu'min believe on the basis of this severe Qur'aanic caution that there was the possibility of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) giving preference to the wealthy and arrogant mushrikeen thereby ignoring the Fuqara Sahaabah? There is not a single Muslim in whose mind this kufr will even cross. Despite the impossibility, Allah Azza Wa Jal speaks reprimandingly to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in a number of Aayaat.

Just as submission to vain desires, fisq and fujoor are negated from the Ambiya, so too, is fisq negated from the Sahaabah, hence no one believes in the fisq of Hadhrat Walid (Radhiyallahu anhu) notwithstanding the *Shaan-e-Nuzool* of the aayat. Only morons draw such corrupt conclusions on the basis of their smattering of text-book knowledge.

The chap asks: *“Would you appreciate if I labelled you an ignoramus, a kafir, etc. and spread the message in the whole world, due to your lack of knowledge of this vital tahqiq?.....So why do we not act the same with our Muslim brothers.....”*

If you are a man of the Haqq, which obviously you are not, and you find us propagating kufr, baatil, bid’ah, *Istikhfaaf* of the *Ahkaam*, and denigration of the Sunnah in the public, then by all means it will be your Waajib obligation to label us as ignoramuses, mudhilleen, zanaadiqah and kuffaar.

Secondly, your statement is stupid in its presumptuousness. What ‘vital tahqiq’ are you hallucinating about? Are you labouring under the impression that you are the sole respository of this ‘vital tahqiq’? Your flimsy ‘tahqiq’ is simply a cut and paste job from the immoral internet. The superficiality of your ‘*tahqiq*’ speaks volumes for your *jahaalat*. We discern no vitality in your cut and paste jobs. On what basis have you concluded that we “lack knowledge of the vital tahqiq” with which you are patting yourself on the back? From whence did you glean this idea? There was no incumbency to introduce this dimension in our criticism of the miscreant tablighi anti-Sunnah character. You have therefore spoken utter trash by implying that you are the

sole originator of the imagined ‘vital tahqiq’. It will serve you good to emerge from your hallucinatory realm of deception. It is scraping the bottom of the barrel to lap up a ‘tahqiq’ from the internet, then attribute it to yourself. That is contemptible plagiarism.

In response to your question: “*So why do we not act the same with our Muslim brothers?*” The character who maligns the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not our brother. He belongs to some camp of deviation. We refuse to embrace him with love when he chides, ridicules and denigrates the Sunnah. We were not dealing with an ordinary sinner – all of us are sinners. We were dealing with a shaitaan in human form donning the mantle of the Tablighi Jamaat. So, desist from stercoraceous acquittal, then you shall not be assigned to the camp of the copro mudhilleen.

Then this character introduces a Hadith of general import which has absolutely no relevance to the topic under discussion. The Hadith he cites is: “*None of you believes until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself.*” The moron has failed to understand the meaning of “brother”. The one who deserves execution for denigrating the Sunnah is not a brother to us. He is an enemy. Any one who scorns the Sunnah by actively propagating it and by denigrating it in public is shaitaan or at least the agent of Iblees. How can such a vile character be our brother? Such an enemy of the Sunnah is excluded from the scope of the Hadith.

Further darkening the pages with his stupidity, the moron paper ‘mujtahid’, rejecting the tafseer of the vast majority of authoritative Mufasssireen on the basis of the internet ‘tahqiq’, disgorges the following rubbish: *“Is the famous incident about Sayyiduna Tha’labah Ibn Hatib (Radhiyallahu anhu) asking Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to make dua Allah Ta’ala increases his wealth and him not paying zakah after becoming wealthy authentic?”*

Answer - Despite the narration being widely quoted, it is unauthentic and not suitable to quote.....”

The refutation for this baseless claim will follow later, Insha-Allah. This piece of drivel, the miscreant student molvi acquired from the internet ‘tahqiq’. He lapped it up and disgorged it as if it is his own ‘tahqiq’ (research).

Shaitaan has corrupted the brains of this moron. The very fame (*Shuhrat*) and acceptability by the authorities of the narration is the daleel for its authenticity. Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi, Mufti Muhammad Shafi and others of our Akaabir Ulama and all the classical Mufasssireen present this narration in the tafseer of the aayat No.75 of Surah Taubah. Ibn Jareer, Ibn Abi Haatim, Ibn Mardawaih, Tabaraani, Baihqi and other great Mufasssireen have all upheld the authenticity of the narration which features in the tafseer of the aayat. The list shall follow later, Insha-Allah.

Firstly, the moron stupidly introduces this aayat and its tafseer into the discussion which have no relationship whatsoever with our topic. There was no need to bring it into the picture. We did not touch on it, and there is nothing of the tafseer which we had presented as daleel for our stance.

Despite this being a digression from the subject, we shall nevertheless, briefly touch on the stupidity illustrated by the upstart paper ‘mujtahid’.

The irrefutable fact is that the person mentioned in the Qur’aanic aayat who had come to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was a Sahaabi. Whether he was Tha’labah Ibn Abi Haatib or any one else is irrelevant. But since the vast majority of Mufasssireen have accepted the narration pertaining to Tha’labah, there is no reason to unnecessarily refute it. If there had been a valid reason, the great Mufasssireen would not have entertained it without critical comment. While this fellow is a moron he seeks by implication to label the Mufasssireen as morons who lacked knowledge in the sphere of Tafseer and Usool-e-Tafseer. The Qur’aan confirms that the person was a munaafiq.

Sahaabi: An objection may be raised regarding the ‘Sahaabi’ status of the one to whom reference is made in the Aayat. The Qur’aan explicitly states that *nifaaq* is confirmed. The response to the objection is that the Aayat is ambiguous regarding the identity of the person involved in this episode. Furthermore, the Aayat predicates the *nifaaq* to a plurality of persons. Thus, it is said: *“Then He (Allah) established nifaaq in their hearts.”*

In the Tafseer of these Aayaat, a plurality of persons is mentioned. It is not restricted to one person. Another noteworthy fact is that Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Umar and Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhum), during the tenure of their respective khilaafats, did not brand Tha’labah a

munaafiq. They had only refused to accept his Sadqah because Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had refused, and they had clarified the reason for their refusal. If Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had accepted his Sadqaat, the Khulafa too would have accepted it without hesitation.

If the *nifaaq* mentioned in the Aayat had applied specifically to Tha'labah, then his kufr/irtidaad would have been confirmed. The consequence would have been his execution. However, he continued to live as a Muslim, and so was he treated during the era of the Khulafah-e-Raashideen until his death during the khilaafat of Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallah anhu).

Furthermore, Rasulullah (Salallahu alayhi wasallam) had understood and had accepted him as a Sahaabi, hence Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) made the Dua for him. And, even after having refused to accept Tha'labah's Sadqaat, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not brand him a munaafiq/murtad. He continued living as a Muslim even while Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was alive.

Since there is no *Qat'iyat* (*absolute certitude*) on this issue, it will be improper to acquit oneself with such certitude which is the effect of *Qat'iyat*. The matter should be left with the ambiguity conferred to it by the Qur'aan Majeed. And Allah knows best.

What has anyway emerged from this narration in our favour is the fact that the Mufasssireen who were embodiments of

Taqwa and paragons of Ilm, considered the practice of naming to be valid, hence they mentioned the name of the person whom the relevant Qur'aanic aayat castigates. It matters not whether the person was Tha'labah or anyone else. The fact is that a name is mentioned by the Mufasssireen. This debunks the stupid theory of the moron student.

Since the scope of this refutation precludes a detailed discussion to establish the identity of the person concerned, we shall not here proceed further with this irrelevant topic.

Presenting another baseless argument, the chap says that after the revelation of the names of the Munaafiqeen, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) "would name the hypocrites". Then he adds: *"So by no means does this text support the practice of naming and shaming."* In fact, by all means it does support our practice, and this is a self-evident fact. Furthermore, we at no stage had presented this Hadith to substantiate the validity of 'naming and shaming' a munaafiq or a mudhil or a zindeeq or an agent of Iblees who disparages the Sunnah. So we do not understand the stupid 'rationale' for making reference to this narration.

Secondly, the existence of the narration despite another narration which informs that the names were entrusted to only Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu), provides a basis for naming and shaming the munaafiqeen. The narration explicitly states:

"Then Allah Ta'ala informed Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) of (the names of the) munaafiqeen. Thereafter he

would call by name a man from the munaafiqeen.” Thus, by unnecessarily introducing this irrelevant narration, the chap has shot himself in the foot.

Then he attempts to negate the validity of naming a deviate by citing such Qur’aanic verses and Ahaadith which are of general import, and which mention the beautiful moral character of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In so doing, he abortively attempts to show that the *Uswah Hasanah* of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was in entirety devoid of sternness and harshness. Where there was the need for severity, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would display such severity which would send shivers down the spines of the Sahaabah. Some such instances are briefly mentioned here:

- The narration of the Urniyyeen.
- The treatment to Banu Quraidhah.
- The execution of some males and females on the occasion of Fatah Makkah, even of the one holding onto the *ghilaaf* of the Ka’bah and begging for mercy.
- Despatching Sahaabah to carry out acts of assassination.
- Ordering the whipping and stoning of certain Sahaabah.
- Ordering cutting the hand of a noble lady who had stolen.
- On occasions cursing the Kuffaar.
- Ordering a man to be burnt out although this order was later rescinded.

- Complimenting the blind Sahaabi who had killed his wife because she had insulted Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam).
- Advising a woman to slap her husband in retaliation. But Allah Ta'ala then prohibited this.
- Calling a person 'Shaitaan'.
- Rasulullah's desire to burn out the houses of those who do not attend Jamaat Salaat. And many more episodes of *Ta'neef*.

This brief list of severity and harshness adopted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) should suffice to debunk the one-sided presentation of his *Uswah Hasanah* by the misguided student. The beautiful moral character of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not preclude severity and harshness wherever such attitude was deemed correct and appropriate.

While the Qur'aan Majeed advises Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to be kind, merciful and forgiving, it also commands: "*And be stern against them.*" While Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has been described in the Qur'aan as "*A Mercy to the worlds*", he has also been commanded to "*kill them wherever they are found*".

In a failed attempt to extract capital for his stupid 'theory', the misguided student presents the commentary of Ibn Hajar and Imaam Nawawi on the reaction of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the occasion when a rustic urinated in the Musjid. When the ignorant villager had urinated in the Musjid, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), without

displaying the slightest annoyance, explained the error to the person. The student molvi presented the following commentary of Ibn Hajar and Imaam Nawawi, which he lapped up from the internet ‘tahqiq’:

“Ibn Hajar said: ‘In it is consideration for the jaahil (ignoramus), and teaching him what is incumbent for him without severity, when it is not because of intransigence.....”

“Nawawi said: ‘In it is consideration for the jaahil, and to teach him without harshness and distress what is incumbent on him when he commits the act (of ignorance) without mukhaalafah (opposition) or istikhfaaf (denigration) or inaad (intransigence).....” The translation is ours. The incompetent student molvi restricted himself to the Atabic text which he plagiarized from the internet.

It is clear that this poor fellow lacks understanding of the texts he presents to bolster his opinion. There is no gainsaying that *ta’leem* and *tableegh* should incumbently be with wisdom, kindness and consideration of the one to whom the *naseehat* is made. This is standard procedure. This is the general methodology, and no one is in abnegation of it. However, the student molvi has failed to understand that the objective of *rifq bil jaahil* (tenderness/kindness with the ignoramus when teaching him) is *Ta’leem*. When this is not the objective other methods are not only justified, but exhorted and incumbent.

When the purpose of naming and shaming is punishment or execution or exposing the devil or saving people from the danger of misguidance of the agent of Iblees, then *rifq bil*

jaahil is not permissible. At such a time it will be stupid or bootlicking or compromising the Haqq or concealing the Haqq as is the habit of the Dumb Devils. Thus, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*He who remains silent regarding the Haqq is a dumb devil.*” The purpose of *rifq bil jaahil* is not to transform one into a dumb devil nor to conceal the Haqq nor to tolerate *Istikhfaaf* and *Istihzaa’* with the Sunnah. For such evil, the other dimension of Rasulullah’s *Uswah Hasanah* is applicable, namely *Ta’neef* (severity/harshness) as was practically demonstrated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

While *rifq* is valid and necessary when advising and admonishing a simple rustic or any other normal person who commits errors out of ignorance, it is not permissible when confronted by the *mukhaalif*, *mu-aanid*, *mudhil*, *zindeeq* and the like whose anti-Sunnah act or act of *zanaadaqah* or act of *istikhfaaf* is deliberate. It is designed by *inaad* and by scorn for the Sunnah. And, this is made crystal clear by Imaam Nawawi, Ibn Hajar, the Sunnah, the Qur’aan and the entire body of the Mashaaiikh whose obligation was *Ta’leem*, *Tableegh*, *Da’wat* and *Islaah of the nafs*. But intellectual density has precluded this student molvi from this comprehension. Whilst he quotes Ibn Hajar and Imaam Nawawi, he appears to be too dense in the skull to understand the conditions mentioned by these Imaams for the validity of *rifq bil jaahil*.

Imaam Nawawi and Ibn Hajar did not mention *Rifq bil jaahil* in negation of *Ta’neef*. No authority of the Shariah had ever ventured that *Rifq* was the sole attitude of Rasulullah’s

methodology. All the Qur'aanic verses and Ahaadith narrations pertaining to tenderness and kindness in admonition and advice, have been cited out of context by the moron. It is not so much an issue of him not being aware of the *innumerable* episodes of *ta'neef* (severity/harshness) displayed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) and the Sahaabah. The oblique or squint-eyed vision with which he views the noble Moral Character of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) is the effect of his insincerity, dishonesty and lack-lustre attitude towards the Sunnah, hence he has been swift to spring to the defence of the *mu-aanid* tabligi doctor who had flagrantly and rudely demonstrated in the public domain his disdain, scorn and *Istikhfaaf* for the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam). The moron student should understand that wearing a big turban is not the be-all of the Sunnah.

He has no option but to concede Rasulullah's severity and naming and shaming of deviates, and because these facets of Rasulullah's *Uswah Hasanah* are so glaringly conspicuous he is compelled to present some convoluted misinterpretation, hence he says: *"If Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) did name some deviates, this was done for a specific reason. But his general overwhelming practice was to impart lessons and not to name and shame."*

Why does the moron say "if" when he is fully aware of the factual position that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) had employed *ta'neef*, not only for deviates, but also for Sahaabah in general? Just as *rifq* is a part of the *Uswah Hasanah* of Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam), so

too is *ta'neef* integral to his *Uswah Hasanah*. Once when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw some expectoration on the Qiblah wall of the Musjid, he went into a rage. The anger was clearly visible on his mubaarak face. And he severely (*ta'neefan*) reprimanded the Sahaabah.

The one with *Ilmi* discernment will not fail to see the great disparity akin to a conundrum in the two episodes, namely, the incident of the *a'raabi* urinating in the Musjid in the presence of the Sahaabah, and the expectoration on the Qiblah wall of the Musjid. Both incidents were committed in the Musjid. Despite urine being filth, and the act of public urinating and that too right inside the Musjid being beyond the confines of all concepts of decency, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) reacted with *rifq bil jaahil*. On the other hand, despite saliva being pure (not najis), and the act of expectoration having no resemblance with the indecency of urinating in the Musjid, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) displayed great opprobrium and *ta'neef* in his *ta'leem* to the Sahaabah for having committed the error of spitting on the Qiblah wall.

A Student of Deen, especially if he chooses to comment on Deeni subjects should have a panoptical view on *dalaa-il* and on all angles of the subject. But this moron has acquitted himself with a display of *jahaalat* which is the satanic effect of the operoseness which he has adopted in defending an enemy of the Sunnah – laboriously misusing the Qur'aan and Ahaadith to defend a deviate who had acquitted himself with *Inaad and Istikhfaaf* of the very Sunnah predicated by the Qur'aan and Ahaadith.

The methodology of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) consisted of both *rifq* and *ta'neef*. These attitudes are applicable to different circumstances. Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) imparted the lesson of both *Hub lillaah* (Love for Allah's Sake), and *Bughd lillaah* (Anger for Allah's sake). But morons lack the understanding of differentiating and application.

Just as Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had a “specific reason for naming deviates”, so too do we have specific reasons for naming deviates, zindeeqs and mudhilleen. We do not embark on criticism for fun and amusement. Both methods of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – *rifq* and *ta'neef* – are for imparting lessons. The moron due to his *jahaalat* has failed to understand that there was a perfect balance between the two opposite methodologies of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). When there was a need for *rifq*, it would be applied. When the need was for *ta'neef*, it would not be spared. The exhortation of keeping a whip at all times displayed in the home to act as a deterrent to mischief and for the *ta'leem* of children, belongs to the domain of *Ta'neef*. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Hang your whip in a way that your family sees it.*” The Ahaadith and the lives of the Sahaabah are replete with episodes in which *Ta'neef* was the mode.

Then the *durrah* (whip) of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was famous. Everyone besides the moron, is aware that it was never *rifq* which ensued from that famous and

noble *durrah*. We can imagine the action of that *durrah* if it had encountered the agent of Iblees who had scorned and denigrated the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The moron student molvi attempts awkwardly to extricate himself from the confusion of his stupid theory which he himself does not understand, relative to 'naming and shaming' by saying: *"So there was a definite reason for this unusual practice of Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wasalam. But his general practice was to admonish as mentioned above."* This is the imbecile's comment on a particular person which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) named and shamed -- a person called Uyainah Bin Hisn. This person had become a murtad. Explaining the reason for naming and shaming this person, Ibn Hajar says:

"Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) intended to expose the condition of this person so that the people recognize him and so that those who are not aware of him and do not become deceived by him."

The student molvi despite presenting this commentary of Ibn Hajar remains blissfully stupid of the reason for exposing, naming and shaming practised by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The specific reason was to save the people from the deception of the agents of Iblees. This is precisely the motivation which constrains us to expose, name and even shame those whom we consider to be the enemies of the Sunnah masquerading as men of piety and knowledge.

His contention that *ta'neef* was not the normal/usual practice of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is baseless. He lacks understanding of Rasulullah's methodology, hence he speaks bunkum. Whenever occasion demanded *ta'neef*, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would employ it, and whenever there was no need for it, *rifq* was the order. It is highly erroneous to contend that *ta'neef* was not the usual practice. *Ta'neef* may not be rubbished away simply because of the greater number of cases and episodes involving *rifq*. The issue is that *ta'neef* was invoked when the need for it developed. The cases of urination and expectoration explained earlier are well-known examples of both facets of Rasulullah's methodology. But this moron student, due to *jahaalat*, presents a lopsided picture of Rasulullah's methodology from which he abortively struggles to eliminate the vital constituent of *ta'neef*.

Portraying his attitude of stupid pontification, the misguided chap says: "*Accordingly, our practice should be to impart lessons, not to name and shame every Muslim who we consider a deviate.*" (Underlining for emphasis is that of the moron)

This crack-pot paper 'mujtahid' is too dim in the brains to understand that the objective of even 'naming and shaming' is "*to impart lesson*". It is not an exercise for fun and amusement. If this chap does not consider a deviate/zindeeq/enemy of the Sunnah to be so, and we do, we are not bound to submit to his copro-principal of *jahaalat*. When the need is to inform people of the evil of the human devils, it devolves on us as an obligation to

proclaim the Haqq and to ensure that we do not join the league of the “Dumb Devils”. While denigration of the Sunnah is tolerable to the moron ‘mujtahid’, for us it is not. And that is the parting of the ways for us. In naming and shaming those who have to be incumbently named and shamed there is much lesson and protection for the ignorant and unwary. Just as Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) named the deviates who pose a danger to the Imaan of the unwary, so too do we name those who beguile and mislead the ignorant *awaamun naas*.

Since his stupid theory pertaining to naming and shaming is thoroughly debunked and demolished by the *Jarah-Ta'deel* practice of the illustrious Muhadditheen who had spared no punches in vehemently criticizing with pejorative epithets narrators whom they considered deviates, liars, frauds and fabricators, this misguided student-molvi says: “*The Muhadditheen had the practice of al-Jar wal Ta dil. This was introduced to protect the pristine Din and the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wasallam. There was a great necessity to do this since the Ahadith of Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wasalam was the source of the Shariah. It was therefore incumbent to protect it from the interpretations of the deviates.*”

O Jaahil! Is there no imperative need to protect the Shariah and the Sunnah in this belated age in close proximity to Qiyaamah? Is there no incumbent need to protect the pristine Deen which is so horribly being mutilated by the droves of human and jinn shayaateen masquerading as men of learning

and piety? Is there no “great necessity” to protect the Shariah and the Sunnah from the interpretations of the deviates?

O Moron ‘mujtahid’! Are you not aware that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“There will ever remain a Taaifah (a small group) in my Ummah until the Day of Qiyaamah who will fight on the Haqq. Those who oppose them and those who do not aid them will not be able to harm them.”*

The misguided fellow is unaware that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that there will be such Ulama until the Day of Qiyaamah who will resolutely confront baatil, expose the fraud of the mudhilleen and separate all the distortions and misinterpretations of the dajjaals from the Deen to guard the pristine purity of Islam. Now, how is it possible for us to maintain silence, when the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is being ruthlessly pillaged and plundered by the innumerable mudhilleen and zanadaqah in our midst, the tablighi doctor being one of them?

Rifq is not the weapon with which to confront and demolish satanic baatil and malicious denigration of the Sunnah by persons claiming to be Muslims. In fact *Rifq* is not even to be employed in every instance of *ta’leem* for children, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that if by the age of ten a child is not regular with Salaat, he/she should be beaten – beaten, not assaulted. There is a big difference.

The practice of *Jarah-Ta'deel* of the Muhadditheen is a glittering *daleel* for the validity of the practice of naming and shaming the enemies of the Sunnah to protect the purity of the Deen. The Muhadditheen named and shamed a person by predicating to his name pejorative degrees such as liar, fraud, fabricator, shaitaan, dajjaal, faasiq, donkey, etc. The tablighi doctor who had denigrated the Sunnah in public is of this breed of deviates who has to be incumbently named and shamed. But Taubah will still save him. At times the Muhadditheen would brand a reliable narrator with the worst of epithets without having instituted an investigation to ascertain the unreliability of the person. They relied on what was reported to them. However, when later the reality and the truth became manifest, they would award accolades and speak glowing of the very Aalim whom they had severely disparaged. Many highly placed Ulama and Fuqaha were unjustly maligned by other reliable Authorities of the Shariah.

Shall we now bring them within the purview of the Qur'aanic Aayat warning us to refrain from spontaneous acceptance of the information conveyed by a 'faasiq'? It is undoubtedly within the parameters of the moron's audacity to label the illustrious Ulama of the Salaf who were experts in the distribution of epithets which in their opinion and in the circumstances were justified.

Digest the following narrative, and reflect:

Ibnul Fadhl < Ali Bin Ibraahim bin Shuaib Al-Ghaazi < Muhammad Bin Ismaaeel Bukhaari (that is Imaam Bukhaari)

said that one of our companions narrated from Hamdawaih who said: ‘I said to Muhammad Bin Maslamah: ‘Why did the opinion (i.e.Math-hab) of An-Nu’maan (i.e. Imaam Abu Hanifah – Rahmatullah alayh) enter all cities except Madinah. Then he (Muslimah) said: ‘Verily, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Neither Dajjaal nor a plague will be able to enter Madinah.’ He (i.e. Imaam Abu Hanifah – Rahmatullah alayh) is **a dajjaal from among the dajjaals.**”

Ibnul Dashi < Ubaidullah Bin Ja’far Bin Durustwaih < Ya’qoob Bin Sufyaan < Hasan Bin Sabaah < Ishaq Bin Ibraaheem Al-Haneeni said that Imaam Maalik said:
“Never was there born in Islam a child who is more harmful for the People of Islam than Abu Hanifah.”

The Dua, *Rahmatullah alayh* appearing in brackets above are our insertions, not that of the narrators in the chain. We shall present more specialities of the science of naming and shaming, but for the sake of brevity, the narrations shall be truncated by discarding the Chains of Narrators.

* Imaam Maalik said: “The fitnah of Abu Hanifah on this Ummah is worse than the fitnah of **Iblees** in two ways: (1) In *Irjaa’*, and (2) in destroying the Sunnah.” Here Imaam Maalik has accused Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) as an ‘enemy of the Sunnah’ to whom he (Imaam Maalik) awarded the title of **‘Iblees’**. What title should be conferred to the tablighi doctor who flagrantly and ruthlessly denigrated the Sunnah in public?

Shareek Bin Abdullah said: “It is better that there be in every suburb of Kufah one who sells liquor than one who promotes the views of Abu Hanifah.”

* When Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) passed away, Imaam Auzaa-ee said: “Alhamdulillaah! He used to dismantle Islam incrementally.”

* Ibn Mubaarak said: “He who uses Kitaabul Hiyaal of Abu Hanifah and issues fatwa on its basis, verily his Hajj is nullified and his wife is forbidden for him.” Then the Maula of Ibn Mubaarak said: “O Aba Abdir Rahman! I know of no one who has fabricated this kitaab except shaitaan.” Ibn Mubaarak said: “The one (i.e. Imaam Abu Hanifah) who has fabricated this kitaab is **viler than shaitaan.**”

* Sufyaan Thauri said: “Seek Allah’s protection from the evil of the Nabati when he pretends to be an Arab.”

* Qais Bin Rabee’ said about Imaam Abu Hanifah: “He is the greatest jaahil....”

* Ubaidullah Bin Idrees said: “Abu Hanifah is a Dhaal (astray) and Mudhil (one who leads astray), and Aby Yusuf is a faasiq among the fussaag.”

* Yazeed Bin Haaron said: “I never saw any people resembling the Nasaara so much as the followers of Abu Hanifah.”

The derogatory epithets, mentioned here, with which Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) had been slandered are merely a sample of the naming and shaming practice. It leaves one agape and aghast. These great Ulama who had unjustly criticized and disparaged Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh), later, after meeting him, or after receiving authentic reports, made amends by the bestowal of accolades and glowing praise for him. If Allah Ta'ala wills, we shall publish a book on this subject. Here, the purpose of mentioning these samples of naming and shaming is only to highlight the jahaalat of the moron student molvi who is starkly ignorant regarding the 'science' of naming and shaming.

Defending the practice of naming, shaming and criticizing the deviates and the enemies of the Deen, Imaam Muslim (Rahmatullah alayh) states, and this is mentioned by even the jaahil in his cut and paste job:

“Criticizing the narrators on the basis of (the defects) within them is permissible. In fact it is Waajib. It is not from such gheebah which is haraam. On the contrary it is to defend the sacred Shariah.”

Well, this is precisely the rationale and the objective underlying our criticism, naming and shaming the deviates who denigrate the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There is **absolutely** no difference between the practice of the Muhadditheen and our practice, and no difference between our practice and the practice of all the Mashaaikh and authorities of the Shariah since the very era

of the Sahaabah. Morons are too dim in the brains to comprehend realities, but they hallucinate having attained the status of ‘ijtihaad’.

Without applying his mind, the jaahil cites Imaam Tirmizi in a stupid bid to give credence to his view of *jahl*. In defence of naming and criticizing deviates, Imaam Tirmizi (Rahmatullah alayh) said:

“They (the Muhadditheen) were constrained to do this (i.e. name, shame and criticize) by Naseehah for the Muslims. It should not be thought of them that their motive was merely to criticize people and make gheebat. Verily they intended to expose the weakness of these people (narrators) so that they (people) come to know. Verily, some of those whom they had denigrated were people of bid’ah, some were dubious regarding Hadith, some were people of ghaflat (irresponsible and careless) committing numerous errors. Thus, these Imaams (of Hadith) intended to expose their conditions for the concern of the Deen and for (maintaining its) firmness.....”

The moron cites without understanding what and why he cites. He simply darkens pages unthinkingly. What Imaam Tirmizi explained here is applicable to us, Alhamdulillaah! To this Allah is Witness! The practice of the Muhadditheen is loud testimony for our stance. Whatever the moron has tried to explain to justify the naming, shaming and damning methodology of the Muhadditheen is applicable to us. There is nothing in our methodology which is in conflict with the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or of the Sahaabah or of the Muhadditheen. However, stupid molvis

and upstart ‘mujtahids’ who mingle and associate with deviates present a lopsided picture of Rasulullah’s methodology to hoodwink the public into understanding that becoming bedfellows with and embracing the criminals who criticize and denigrate the Sunnah, are from the method of ta’leem of Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In so doing they are either ignorant of the other side of the coin or dishonestly concealing it to perpetuate their unholy embrace of the enemies of the Sunnah and the Deen.

Exhibiting his ignorance, the *jaahil* says: *“Moreover, usul (principles) were laid down by the Muhadditheen to ascertain whether a narrator was reliable or not. It was not just to label and criticise every narrator.....This proves that the science of al Jar wa al Ta dil was to protect the pristine Shariah.”* This averment is in confirmation of our stance which is based on sound *usool* designed to protect the pristine purity of the Shariah and the Sunnah and to save it from the baatil interpolations and misinterpretations of the frauds, zindeeqs and mudhilleen.

Lacking in entirety in dalaa-il for his utterly baseless theory, he cites Ahaadith, etc. at random, simply cutting and pasting lengthy texts from Salafi websites – texts which have no relevance to the subject under study and scrutiny. For instance he quotes the Hadith: *“He who speaks a lie on me should prepare his abode in the Fire.”* He simply darkens pages with cut and paste jobs having no relationship to the topic or to his corrupt theory. Far from these Ahaadith being in negation of our stance, on the contrary, our attitude and methodology are fully supported and vindicated by all the

Ahaadith he unthinkingly proffered for his hallucination. And what is the ‘lie’ in our criticism of the zindeeq tablighi doctor? On the contrary, the miscreant denigrator of the Sunnah is guilty of lies in the name of the Deen, for he stupidly claimed that the Sunnah style of eating is not meant for the walimah.

Further providing substantiation for our stance, the moron cites the following Ahaadith:

“Towards the end of this Ummah shall be people who will narrate to you what you and your fathers have not heard of. Save yourselves from them.”

“In aakhiruz zamaan (end of times) there will be such dajjaaloon (plural of dajjaal) kath-thaaboon (great liars) who will come to you with such ahaadith which neither you nor your fathers have heard. Beware of them. Save yourselves from them so that they do not embroil you in trial.”

These narrations bring within their scope all dajjaals, liars, zindeeqs and mudhilleen, and all enemies of the Sunnah who have mushroomed in this era of *Aakhiriz Zamaan* in which we find ourselves. They present weird interpretations to bolster their anti-Sunnah attitude and for justifying scuttling the Sunnah as the tablighi doctor had perpetrated when he vented his spleen and embarked on a tirade of criticism when he observed the Brother sitting and eating on the ground in Sunnah style. All such miscreants come within the purview of these Ahaadith. Hence, we adopt the principle of naming and criticizing the enemy of the Sunnah to save people from deviation, and this is precisely Rasulullah’s command: *“Beware! Save yourselves from them!”*

The *jaahil* in his endeavour to portray himself as an expert of Hadith and Usool of Hadith, especially of the branch known as *Jarah wa Ta'deel*, sweeps at random from internet websites to darken some pages so as to convey expertise. However, he succeeds only in projecting his own *jahaalat*. The discussion pertaining to *Jarah-Ta'deel* which the moron has introduced in his flotsam article bears no relevance to the topic under discussion. It is therefore a futile digression to refute what he has presented. Whatever he has quoted from the kutub is correct, but inapplicable to the subject we are arguing in this refutation.

In his cut and paste jobs gleaned from Salafi sites, he has gone off at a wide tangent from the topic which is our stance of exposing the mudhilleen and the enemies of the Sunnah and for which the basis and arguments are solid and abundant, grounded in the Qur'aan and Sunnah. He fails to present concrete evidence to bolster his hallucinatory stupid theory of the total prohibition of criticizing those who condemn the Sunnah and those who mutilate the Shariah and those who embark on transmogrification of Islam.

Coming out in defence of the tablighi doctor who had denigrated the Sunnah, the moron paper 'mujtahid' says:

"Let us examine the incident at hand about the Tablighi elder and the sitting on the floor situation. Did you investigate whether what transpired was true or not? Or did you just send out the message as received. The honour of a Muslim is at stake here but we hardly consider this.

If what you mentioned is false, then you have slandered the Muslim brother which is a great offense and sin."

This moron upstart paper ‘mujtahid’ compounds not only his *jahaalat*, but also his insincerity and the aversion for the Haqq lurking in his heart, hence he has posed his drivel questions to side track from the truth by conveying the idea that the brother who had reported the anti-Sunnah episode had done so on the basis of hearsay, without verifying the facts of the situation.

This *jaahil* despite being fully aware that the Brother who had reported the incident was the actual person involved, attempts to create the impression of the report being hearsay. He did not acquire the information from another person who had claimed whatever had been attributed to the tablighi doctor. Earlier in this treatise, the full text of the Brother’s letter has been reproduced for the benefit of readers who are being deliberately misled by the *jaahil* student-molvi by his convolution of the truth.

It is a fact of truth that the Brother who had complained about the Satanism of the tablighi character, was the person directly involved. There is no intermediary between the person involved and *The Majlis* who had published the incident.

Readers who have a love for the Sunnah even if they may not be fully observant of the Sunnah, should reflect on the remarks of the miscreant tablighi doctor, and they will not fail to understand the villainy, in fact, kufr of his shaitaani tirade. This miscreant doctor sahib harbouring malice for the Brother because of the previous day’s observance of the Sunnah, remarked:

“I wanted to tell you on Friday when I saw you, that this what you are doing is very wrong. You cannot sit on the floor here. There is a time and place for everything and this is not the place to do this Sunna.”

These remarks of kufr are confirmed by the very Brother to whom they were directed. The miscreant doctor said: ***“What you are doing is very wrong.”*** We ask this shaitaan: What was the Brother doing? He was sitting on the floor eating in Sunnah style. But this Sunnah for the miserable tablighi doctor was “wrong”. On this ground of explicitly contending that the Sunnah is wrong, he lost his Imaan.

Then the miserable deviate said: ***“You cannot sit on the floor here.”*** Thus, he clearly forbids the Sunnah and registers his aversion for Rasulullah’s style of eating. Why could he not sit on the floor? What cogent reason does this agent of Iblees have for prohibiting the Brother from sitting on the floor?

Continuing his rubbish kufr tirade, the tablighi elder said: ***“There is a time and place for everything..”*** What time was it and what place was it where the Brother sat on the floor to abide by the Sunnah? It was a Walimah which is also Sunnah and which has to be incumbently discharged in strict accord with the Sunnah. It was a Walimah venue. An arrangement to sit on the floor was readily available. Now when does the Sunnah of eating have to be done? When inside the toilet or is the Sunnah reserved for Tablighi Jamaat gatherings and functions? What type of Sunnah observance is it, and what type of love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) is that

attitude which finds observance of the Sunnah at Tablighi Jamaat ijtimas and functions acceptable but intolerable at a Masnoon Walimah function? Only *zanaadaqah* or *nifaaq* breeds such vile intolerance for the Sunnah. In the Tablighi Ijtimas' tent the doctor character portrays himself as a *buzrug* of status, hence he will sit there on the floor without any qualms to flaunt piety. But elsewhere he deems it inappropriate to 'debase' himself with the glorious Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Let him hang his head in shame, and make Taubah and renew his Imaan.

The moron says that "the honour of a Muslim is at stake". Let us look at the Muslims whose honour is at stake as a consequence of this anti-Sunnah episode enacted by the tablighi doctor. Here are three parties involved: The honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the honour of the Brother who acted in accordance with the Sunnah, and the honour of the tablighi doctor who scorned and spurned the Sunnah. Now whose honour has to be upheld in terms of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith?

The doctor character violated the honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by having denigrated and insulted the Sunnah. The same miserable entity violated the honour of the Muslim Brother who was quietly eating in accordance with the Sunnah. This Brother did not pick an argument or debate with the villain doctor or with anyone else regarding eating on the floor. He sat quietly eating his meal in Sunnah style. The doctor character rudely barged in to express his aversion for the Sunnah.

The events confirm that the doctor fellow has no honour – no Islamic honour. His act exhibited his *zanaadaqah* or his *nifaaq*. The honour that is at stake is the honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the honour of the Brother who fulfilled the Sunnah quietly with dignity and respect while the miscreant violated and sullied the honour of both.

Further blundering into confusion the moron paper ‘mujtahid’ introduces the episode of *Ifq* when Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) was slandered by the likes of the doctor who had spat out his aversion for the Sunnah. The episode of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) far from negating our stance, on the contrary confirms the validity of our Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahy Anil Munkar and guarding the Sunnah.

The salient aspects of this incident of slander which support our stance are:

- (1) The slanderers were named and shamed.
- (2) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not react with *rifq*.
- (3) The reaction was with *ta’neef*. Three persons, a male and two females, were flogged 80 lashes each for having slandered Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anu).

The *rifq bil jaahil* aspect of Rasulullah’s methodology was not implemented. The opposite policy of *ta’neef* (harshness/severity) was instituted. There is nothing in this episode to bolster the stupidity of the moron student-molvi.

Rifq (tenderness) is not applicable to all occurrences and to every one.

The moron further confirming our stance states stupidly labouring under the idea of proffering support for his own convolution: *“The practice of our Ulama and elders has been to name the deviates in order to protect the Iman of Muslims. Deviates like Mirza Ghulam Ahmed, etc. have been exposed. This is because they had kufr beliefs and ideologies and they were leading the Muslims astray.”*

This is precisely what we are doing. We protect the Imaam of the masses by exposing the deviates just as was the practice of our Akaabireen and of the Salafus Saaliheen. We may add that this upstart paper ‘mujtahid’ had never been in the company of our Akaabir Ulama nor did he even see any of them. He has absolutely no relationship with our Akaabir Ulama, yet he falsely seeks to create such an image for himself. His statement only adds strength to our practice.

The ideology of the tablighi doctor in which he makes the Sunnah a hobby or restricts it to some places and occasions, is kufr. The masses have to be incumbently apprized of this man’s kufr ideology because the Tablighi Jamaat advertises him as a ‘senior’, and he sits on the jamaat’s shura board. It is haraam to have a deviate on the shura council.

In another silly attempt to justify his stupid theory, the moron says: *“Furthermore, the deviation of these deviates was primarily in aqidah, for example the Qadiyanis, Shias, etc.”*

The deviation of a zindeeq and an anti-Sunnah miscreant is in fact deviation in Aqeedah. Hitherto, we have not named

and shamed any Molvi who sits on chairs eating from tables. We have not heard such practical flouters of the Sunnah speaking scornfully of the Sunnah as the zindeeq doctor had acquitted himself, hence there developed no occasion for naming and shaming them as we believe, and we hope we are correct, that their Aqeedah regarding the Sunnah is proper notwithstanding their fisq of emulating the style of the kuffaar in practical life. So what the moron paper ‘mujtahid’ says is bunkum which exhibits his *jahaalat*.

Furthermore, *Aqeedah* being the only ground for justifying naming and shaming of a deviate is a stupid and false claim. Ulama have named and shamed other Ulama on the basis of Fiqhi difference, bid’ah, historical data and even in a fit of rage. This will be shown in the ensuing pages, Insha-Allah.

The *jaahil* asks: “*Did we observe our Akabir naming and shaming and labelling others who had differences of opinion in fiqh or other non-aqidah related issues?* Firstly, who are the Akaabir of this chap? They are not our Akaabir. Secondly, who are the ones whom we have named and shamed because of fiqh difference? It devolves on the moron to provide precise information, and we shall then, Insha-Allah, respond to his *khuraafaat*. If he has in mind differences on the carrion chicken and rotten meat issues, then we advise him to get lost. Those who halaalize carrion are not doing so on the basis of valid Fiqhi dalaa-il. They halaalize carrion because they are agents of Iblees, and their objective is haraam boodle. In every case of naming and shaming persons, such modernists, zindeeqs or ulama-e-soo’ are targeted who are *mudhilleen* whose opinions lack in

entirety in Fiqhi/Deeni substance. The moron is too stupid to understand the difference.

Whenever an Aalim structures his case on Fiqhi/Shar'i dalaail, then despite our counter opinion, we do not name and shame him, and there are many such current instances of which the moron chap is totally ignorant. The moron's contention is that we embark on *tajheel* (labelling as ignorant), *tafseeq* (labelling as faasiq), *tadhleel* (labelling as deviate) and *takfeer* (branding as kaafir) any one with whom we differ on Fiqhi issues. Now let the moron explain if our difference with the tablighi doctor is based on Fiqhi differences. Our stance in this regard is denunciation on the basis of denigration (*Istikhfaaf*) of the Sunnah, and *Inkaar* (rejection) of the Sunnah. Thus for the doctor character we have the label of *Zindeeq*.

The moron cites unrelated Ahaadith which have absolutely no bearing on the issue at hand. For example, he quotes the Hadith: "*Swearing a Muslim is transgression and killing him is kufr.*" His *jahl* is indeed lamentable. He brings the Sahaabah, the Fuqaha and the Muhadditheen within the purview of this Hadith and similar other narrations. Whilst his intention is to direct *tafseeq* and *takfeer* at us, all the authorities of the Shariah by virtue of the motive for labelling between them and us being a common factor, are brought within the scope of these Ahaadith.

Sahaabah killing Sahaabah in the battles of Jamal and Siffeen are sad and lamentable facts which cannot be denied. Does the *jaahil* bring all these illustrious Sahaabah within the

scope of the Hadith which he has stupidly cited in a stupid bid to apply it to us? Muhadditheen insulting Muhadditheen and great Ulama vituperating against other Ulama are irrefutable facts. Are they all within the scope of the Hadith? Which Aqeedah did Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh) protect when in a fit of rage he branded the great Muhaddith, Ibn Ishaq with the epithet: *“A great dajjaal from the dajjaals”*? There are innumerable examples of ‘beautiful artefacts’ of the science of pejoration employed by the Salafus Saaliheen to deride and disparage adversaries whom they considered to be deviates not necessarily in Aqeedah.

These Ahaadith have specific application, and so too does the criticism of the Ulama-e-Haqq have specific reference, and its application is dictated by Shar’i cause and principle of which the moron paper ‘mujtahid’ is ignorant. *Akhlaaqi (moral)* methodology applicable to everyone in every day life in normal activities of life, may not be applied to specific situations of Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar which may require the Sunnah of *Ta’neef* which had been practically demonstrated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

The *jaahil* asks: *“Is it correct and appropriate to advise your Muslim brother personally and secretly or to defame and humiliate him in front of the entire world?”*

Why does this ignoramus not direct this question to the tablighi doctor zindeeq who is guilty of:

- Defaming a brother Muslim in public
- Humiliating a brother Muslim in front of the whole world?

And why does the moron not admonish the zindeeq by asking him:

- Why did you not advise your Muslim brother secretly if you believed that the Sunnah was nonsense?
- Why did you not call your Muslim brother into privacy and explain to him that it was not permissible for him to observe the Sunnah in public for in so doing he was bringing disgrace to the host with the Sunnah?

The *jaahil* student molvi should adjust the facts of the episode correctly, and endeavour to understand just who was the one who had insulted what and whom, and who was the one who had humiliated in public a brother Muslim? Who had created the controversy and what was the basis of the controversy initiated by the zindeeq?

Just who did the insulting, and who and what was being insulted? The Brother who was quietly eating his food in the style of our Beloved Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) narrates:

“I tried to calm him down by saying that it is my habit and that I am not comfortable with eating at a table. Before I could finish my sentence, he cut me off by nodding his head as if he was disappointed, and said: ‘No! No! No! There are big big Ulama here. You are insulting them. You are insulting our guests and our hosts by doing this here. We even eat on the floor at home, but here we don’t do this. This is not the place.....

There are great great Ulama here. Who are you?....You come here and insult everybody. How can you go and sit like this here?’ I was almost in tears at this point.”
(Underlining is ours to emphasize the scorn for the Sunnah.)

Let us not submit this flotsam tirade of kufr to Imaani scrutiny. The underlined term, namely ‘this’ in the aforementioned quote refers in each case to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). According to the doctor agent of Iblees, the Brother was insulting the ‘big’ and ‘great’ Ulama and the hosts and the guests with his Sunnah style of eating on the floor. The zindeeq further emphasized that the walimah venue was not the place to observe the Sunnah. The Sunnah has to be executed in privacy in the home and in Tablighi Jamaat tents and Musjids where the Jamaat puts up on its excursions. People and other places should not be ‘disgraced’ and ‘insulted’ with the Sunnah.

This is the tirade of kufr, and this is the author of the kufr which the miserable moron student-molvi is laboriously and abortively defending by assigning baatil interpretations to the Qur’aan and Ahaadith. In so doing he has supported kufr and thus he comes squarely within the purview of the Ahaadith which say: “*He who speaks a lie on me intentionally should prepare his abode in the Fire.*”

The *jaahil* has supported a zindeeq who insulted the honour of a Muslim – who insulted the Sunnah, and in so doing, he insulted the honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The ‘big big’ and the ‘great great’ ulama who were present condoning the scurrilous attack on the Sunnah

are in reality big big and great great donkeys. Such vile villains may not be called Ulama, for Ulama are they who stand up for the Haqq and who defend the Sunnah even at the price of sacrificing their lives.

Whilst we are circumspect with the mild designation of ‘donkeys’, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayi wasallam) was vehement with his method of *Ta’neef* with his appellation of “*DUMB DEVILS*”. This is the appropriate designation for those so-called ‘big big’ ulama who had supported the zindeeq tablighi doctor with their satanic silence when the Sunnah was under violent attack right in front of their eyes.

When the zindeeq doctor’s wife was informed of her husband’s tirade of kufr and callous treatment of the guest who had opted for Rasulullah’s Sunnah, she broke down crying. May Allah Ta’ala reward her tears with the the lofty mansions of Jannatul Firdaus.

O Jaahil molvi! Your rodомontade citation of the Qur’aanic verse: “*Call to the Path of your Rabb with wisdom and beautiful preaching.*”, reeks of *nifaaq*, for your defence of kufr is the effect of hidden and perhaps unknown kufr deep in your heart. We advise that you should recite this aayat to the zindeeq tablighi doctor. Was his outburst within the parameters of the *Hikmat and Mau’izah Hasanah* mentiond in the Aayat which you have presented in defence of your indefensible *khuraafaat*? Ask your zindeeq friend to view his insults in the mirror of this very Aayat to ascertain the degree of his kufr.

AL-HUBB FILLAAH WAL BUGHD
FILLAAH
(LOVE FOR THE SAKE OF ALLAH AND
HATRED/ ANGER FOR THE SAKE OF ALAH)

For the further edification of the misguided student molvi, we present some Ahaadith of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(1) Hadhrat Abu Zarr (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrated: “Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) came to us and said: ‘Do you know which deed is most loved by Allah Ta’ala?’ Someone said: ‘Salaat and Zakaat’. Another one said: ‘Jihad.’ Then Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘The most loved deed by Alah Ta’ala is Love for Allah’ and Hatred for Allah’s Sake.”

The two dimensions of Rasulullah’s methodology of advice and admonition are established in the Hadith.

(2) “He who gives for the Sake of Allah, prevents/prohibits for the Sake of Allah, marries for the Sake of Allah, loves for the Sake of Allah, and hates for the Sake of Allah, verily he has perfected his Imaan.”

(3) Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) said to the Taabi-ee, Mujaahid: “O Mujaahid! Love for Allah. Hate for Allah. Befriend for Allah. Become enemy for Allah. Then, most assuredly, with this you will acquire what is by Allah. Never will a person obtain the sweetness of Imaan

without this even with abundance of Salaat and fasting. Verily, nowadays the friendship of people in general is because of the dunya, and that is not sufficient in the least.” Then he recited the Qur’aanic Aayat: *“Friends on that Day (of Qiyaamah) will be enemies to one another except the Muttaqeen.”*, and he also recited: *“You will not find a people believing in Allah and the Last Day befriending (loving) one who opposes Allah and His Rasool.”*

The generality of these Qur’aanic verses brings the zindeeq tablighi doctor within their purview. He opposed Allah and His Rasool with his opposition to and insult for the Sunnah.

(4) Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “He who establishes Salaat, pays Zakaat, listens (to Allah’s Law) and obeys, verily he has moderated Imaan (i.e. his Imaan is of middle class). And, he who loves for Allah, hates for Allah gives for Allah and prevents/withholds for Allah, verily he has perfected Imaan.”

(5) Mujaahid (Rahmatullah alayh) said: “Verily, the strongest handle of Imaan (by which to hold), is love for Allah and hatred for Allah.”

Explaining the meaning of *“the most powerful handle of Imaan”*, Ibn Rajab Hambali says in his Kitaab, *Jaamiul Uloom Wal Hikam*: “Regarding *Bughdh fillaah*, it is the most powerful handle of Imaan. It (this hatred) is not among the prohibitions. If evil becomes manifest from someone, and he (the observer) exhibits anger at him whilst in reality the man

(who committed the evil) is *ma'zoor* (i.e. he had a valid excuse), (then too) the *Mubghidh* (the one who vented his anger for Allah's Sake), will be rewarded."

Ar-Rabee' Bin Khuthaim said: "If you see a man flagrantly committing evil and concealing his goodness, and you express *bughdh* for him, Allah will reward your anger expressed against the evil."

Undoubtedly, *Bughdh fillaah* may not be used as a smokescreen for *nafsaaniyat*. It is haraam to express *bughdh* for any wordly or nafsaani motive. The one who embarks on this delicate issue has to constantly reflect and take a reckoning of his intentions to ensure that his anger/hatred is genuinely *Bughdh fillaah*.

Bughdh fillah as well as *Hubb fillaah* are integral constituents of Rasulullah's methodology and *Uswah Hasanah*. Similarly, are *Rifq* and *Ta'neef*. Each attribute has to be applied correctly. There is benefit in both. Misplacement of any valid method is either harmful or ineffective. It is stupidity to apply *Rifq* in every case, and to attempt negating *Ta'neef* in entirety as the *jaahil* student molvi has endeavoured solely for defending a man who has flagrantly and rebelliously insulted the Sunnah and the honour of a Muslim.

The misguided student has proffered the advice of studying the works of Shaikh Abdul Fattaah Abu Ghuddah. For his edification, this Shaikh states in his kitaab, *Ar-Rasoolul Muallim*, in the section captioned: "*The wrath (ghadhb) and*

harshness (Ta'neef) of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in Ta'leem when the situation demanded it:

“Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) used to become extremely angry when the muta-allim would in his argument and question traverse to the extent which was not appropriate and delve in it. An example of this (anger, etc.) is the narration of Ibn Maajah. The Sahaabah were arguing about Qadr (Taqdeer). Rasulullah’s face became red with anger (ghadb) like the seeds of a pomegranate. In anger he said: “Have you been commanded with this or have you been created for this?....because of this, nations before you were destroyed.”

Besides this example mentioned in the aforementioned Kitaab, there are many examples evidencing Rasulullah’s extreme anger which visibly showed on his mubaarak face. The incident of the saliva on the Qiblah wall, and other episodes have already been mentioned earlier.

On the specific issue of naming and exposing the one who misguides others, Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) said to his Student, Imaam Abu Yusuf (Rahmatullah alayh): “When you are aware of the evil of a person, then do not speak/mention this about him, but search for goodness from him, and speak about it, **except in the matter of Deen. If you are aware of it (evil) in his Deen then mention him to the people so that they do not follow him and so that they stay away from him. Rasulullah (Alayhis salaam) said: ‘Mention the faajir with that in which he indulges so that the people stay away from him even if he is a man of status and position.’**”

And the person in whom you see corruption of the Deen, mention that (to the people) and do not be concerned of his status, for verily, Allah Ta'ala is your Aid, and your Helper and the Helper of the Deen..”

It is clear that those who mislead people – those who are mudhilleen – those who pose a danger to the Deen of the people must be incumbently exposed. Defending the mudhilleen and those who flagrantly oppose and denigrate the Sunnah is the effect of giving preference to the dunya over the Deen, hence we find that the misguided molvis while taking umbrage when the deviates are criticized, acquit themselves like dumb devils when the Deen is insulted and denigrated or distorted. In so doing, they are playing with fire. The following episode should be salubrious for the ulama-e-soo' whose focus is on the dunya, not on the Deen.

Imaam Haakim Al-Jaleel (Rahmatullah alayh) who was martyred by the Tartars had condensed from the Kutub of Imaam Muhammad (Rahmatullah alayh) masaa-il for the benefit and ease of the Ulama of the time. He named his kitaab, *Al-Muntaqa*. All the masaa-il of *Al-Muntaqa* were from the Kutub of Imaam Muhmmad (Rahmatullah alayh). In other words, it was an abridged version of Imaam Muhammad's kutub.

In a dream he saw Imaam Muhammad (Rahmatullah alayh) asking him: 'Why did you do this with my Kutub?' Haakim Al-Jaleel (Rahmatullah alayh) said: 'Because in the Fuqaha (of this era) there is lethargy. I therefore deleted the repetitions and mentioned the established masaa-il for ease (of comprehension).' Then, in the dream Imaam Muhammad

(Rahmatullah alayh) displayed wrath (anger –ghadhb), and he cursed: ‘May Allah cut you (asunder) as you have cut (mutilated) my Kutub.’

Indeed this was a terrible and a fearful curse which had materialized in real life. The Tartars had martyred Haakim Al-Jaleel in a brutal manner. He (Rahmatullah alayh) was sawn into two parts. Just prior to the execution, Haakim Al-Jaleel (Rahmatullah alayh) said: **‘This is the punishment of one who preferred the dunya over the Aakhirat. When the Aalim conceals his knowledge and abandons its right, it is then feared that he will be embroiled in what will be horrible to him.’**

Allah Ta’ala knows the mystery. We only fear. We cannot comment on this episode which is beyond our comprehension. The abridgement, *Al-Muntaqa* is a wonderful aid for the Fuqaha and Ulama who are lost and bewildered in the original masterpieces of Fiqh of Imaam Muhammad. What was the mystery underlying Imaam Muhammad’s curse, Allah Ta’ala Alone knows.

The lesson for the ulama-e-soo’ who miserably fail to discharge the *huqooq* of Ilm is the last *naseehat* of Hakeem Al-Jaleel (Rahmatullah alayh). All those ‘big big’ and ‘great great’ molvis who were sitting on chairs, eating from tables and spectating in silence the vilification of the honour of Rasulullah’s Sunnah and the insult of the honour of a Muslim Brother quietly observing the Sunnah, should sit up, reflect and endeavour to assess how deep they are trapped in the quagmire of baatil.

Concealing the faults and sins of people refers to such sins which are committed in the sinner's private capacity – sins which he does not advertise – sins which he does not justify – sins which are not committed in denigration of the Sunnah or rebelliously against the Shariah. It is not permissible to publicize such sins of the people. However, regarding those who advertise their lusts in the public and recklessly perpetrate fisq and fujoor with an attitude of intransigence and scorn for the Deen, Imaam Muhammad (Rahmatullah alayh) said: *“Regarding the man of hawa (lust) who perpetrates it flagrantly in public and the faasiq who commits fisq flagrantly (in the public), there is nothing wrong mentioning these two along with their deeds.”*

The *faasiq mu'lin* (the *faasiq* who himself exposes his sins in public) is bereft of honour, and he does his own naming and shaming. The basis for naming and exposing those who pose a danger to the Imaan of people is the Hadith: *“Why do you desist from mentioning the faajir (an immoral person) with his indulgence (in fujoor)? Expose him until the people are aware of him. Mention him with his indulgence so that the people are saved from him. Mention him so that the people are saved from him, for there is no gheebat of him.”* (The double mention is in the Hadith)

The Fuqaha have excluded several persons from the proscription of gheebat. Isaa Ibn Dinaar (Rahmatullah alayh) said: “There is no gheebat regarding three persons: A tyrannical ruler, a flagrant faasiq, and a man of Bid'ah.”

Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah alayh) has elaborated in his *Ihya-ul Uloom* the topic of the need for gheebat. In Raddul

Muhtaar it is mentioned: *“If a man fasts, performs Salaat, and he (also) distresses people with his hands and his tongue, then mentioning him with his (evil) indulgences is not gheebat. In fact, if he is reported to the Sultan, he should punish him.”*

To save people from the distress of even a ‘pious’ person as mentioned in Shaami (above), it is permissible to name him and his evils, and if he is shamed and disgraced in the process of naming, the informed is not sinful in any way whatsoever. The intention is not to ‘shame’ and humiliate the inconsiderate buzrug who spends his time in Nafl ibaadat but at the same time causes *takleef* to his neighbours. He may be mentioned by name. As for ‘shame’ which the moron student molvi adds to his stupid theory, it is a concomitant effect of naming the villain. It is not the intention of the one who engages in *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahy Anil Munkar*. The one who upholds the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma’roof* understands that *tahqeer* (holding in contempt) is haraam. Thus, ‘shaming’ while it is part of the moron’s theory, it is never the intention when naming the miscreant who misguides people with his deviation. The deviate brings shame upon himself with his haraam villainy.

In *Tambeehul Ghaafileen*, Abu Laith Samarqandi (Rahmatullah alayh) says: *“Permissible gheebat is to mention a faasiq who publicizes his fisq. If a faasiq is mentioned in order to save people (from his evil), he (i.e. the one who names the faasiq) will be rewarded for naming. Because it (such naming) is Nahyi anil Munkar.”*

There is no gainsaying that if the naming of the faasiq, zindeeq, mudhil, enemy of the Sunnah, etc. is because of despicable nafsaaani motives, it is sinful and not permissible. So it devolves on the accuser – the jaahil molvi – to gain valid evidence by delving into our hearts to substantiate any evil designs which he believes are the motive for our naming of the agents of Iblees.

The protection of the Shariah, the Sunnah and the Imaan of the masses is of paramount importance. It has greater importance than the ‘honour’ of a person who vilifies the Sunnah or who misleads people or who poses a threat to the Imaan of the masses. Shaami explicitly states the permissibility, in fact *Wujoob*, of naming the culprits: *“The sixth (example of permissibility) is to criticize the majrooheen narrators (i.e. narrators who are unreliable), witnesses and authors (of books for their zanaadaqah, etc.). This is jaa-iz, in fact Waajib for the protection of the Shariah.”*

In a Hadith in *Al-Mu’jamul Kabeer of Tabaraani*, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“There is no gheebat regarding the faasiq.”* A faasiq who advertises his fisq can be named, and to greater degree should the denigrator of the Sunnah be named and criticized for the villainy of *Istikhfaaf* and *Inkaar* of the Sunnah.

In *Nawaadirul Usool fi Ahaadithir Rasool* the issue of naming is explained as follows in the discussion of the Hadith: *“Do you hesitate from mentioning the faajir?”*

Mention him so people are saved from that (fujoor) which is in him”:

“It means: When the person’s fujoor overwhelms him (i.e. is abundant), and he publicizes it, and rips off his (own) veil, then there remains no (concealing) veil for him. It is then impossible for him to conceal his fujoor. (Furthermore), concealing his matter (i.e. his fujoor) is khiyaanat, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:(the above Hadith). Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explained the benefit of naming (the faajir) by saying: ‘So that the people are saved from what is in him. Verily, this (function) of naming is for the one whose duty it is to give naseehat to the public.’”

In Umdatul Qaari of BadrudDeen Al-Aini, is mentioned: *“The one who flagrantly (indulges in fisq) is excluded from (the meaning of) gheebat because of the Hadith (of Rasulullaah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – same Hadith as above.*

Explaining the issue of concealing and naming, is the following commentary in *Faidhul Qadeer*: *“Since the Hadith exhorts concealment (of the faults of) a Muslim, and warns against exposing him, they (the Sahaabah) desisted from naming him (the faajir) by virtue of the sanctity of Tauheed (in the culprit). Therefore he (Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explained to them that concealment is for those entitled to concealment. However, when the person’s fujoor is overwhelming and he is unconcerned about it, then he has no honour. Therefore his*

affair (of fujoor) should not be concealed. In fact naming him is Waajib, and refraining from it is khiyaanat."

The justification for naming and exposing the deviate who publicizes his deviation is based on the Ahaadith in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself commands that *"his veil of concealment be ripped off"*.

Hadhrat Hasan Basri (Rahmatullah alayh) said: *"Your naming a man who publicly sins and does not conceal it, is a virtue recorded for you."* A Hadith narrated by Imaam Muslim (Rahmatullah alayh) states: *"Everyone of my Ummah is forgiven except the mujaahiroon".* The mujaahiroon are those who advertise their sins thereby exposing what Allah has concealed for them. They make this lawful for no valid reason.

The majority (of the Ulama) say that it is permissible to say to a faasiq: *'O faasiq!, or O so and so! (i.e. whatever epithets befit him)* on condition that the intention is naseehat for him or for others or for warning against his (evil) deed, not with the intention of slandering. Thus, a valid intention is necessary (for this permissibility).

.....And, it is permissible in the state of anger for the Sake of Allah Ta'ala on the basis ofthe statement of Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) in the episode of Haatib, "Leave me to strike the neck of this munaafiq.", and the statement of Usaid for Sa'd: "Verily, you are a munaafiq disputing on behalf of the munaafiqeen." Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not object (to this name-calling) statements which were made in his presence." (Subulus Salaam)

Noteworthy is the fact that the Sahaabi Haatib (Radhiyallahu anhu) branded a ‘munaafiq’ by Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was a Badri. He had participated in the Battle of Badr, but this did not inhibit Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) from labelling him a ‘munaafiq’.

The following anecdote narrated by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) in his *Bawaadirun Nawaadir* should also assist in divesting the jaahil’s clogged brains from the cobwebs of *jahaalat* which has constrained him to write drivel in defence of his co-religionist tablighi doctor, and to tolerate and defend the vile comments against the Sunnah.

“Know that the element of permissibility for mentioning the evils of another person is a valid motive. That valid motive is unattainable except with it (i.e. mentioning the evils of the person). This motive cancels the sin of gheebat,.....

Bukhaari narrated in Kitaabut Tafseer from Sa’d Bin Junaid who said to Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhuma): ‘Nauf Bakaali thought that Musa the companion of Khidhr was not Musa of Bani Israaeel.’ Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) then said:

‘The enemy of Allah has lied.’

In the annotation, Al-Kirmaani said: “He (Ibn Abbaas) said so in the state of extreme anger.’ In reality, he (Nauf Bakaali) was a Mu’min, a Muslim of beautiful Islam.” Also in the Haashiyah in Kitaabul Ilm, regarding the term, *Aduw wallaah* (*Enemy of Allah*), the Ulama said that this was by way of *zajar* (*reprimanding, warning, threatening*).The

reality is that he (Al-Bakaali) was a Mu'min and the Imaam of the people of Damascus. Ibnut Teen said: 'Ibn Abbaas did not intend to expel Nauf from the Wilaayat of Allah. However, the hearts of the Ulama are disgusted when they hear that what is not Haqq, then they employ such statements for the purpose of rebuking. The reality is that it is not the intention (to expel from the fold of Islam).'"

The moron defender of the anti-Sunnah tablighi doctor should now reflect. There are a number of lessons and salient facts in the manner in which Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu alayhi) had acquitted himself in hurling the extremely grave and humiliating epithet of "*Aduwallaah – Enemy of Allah*" at such an illustrious Aalim of the Haqq as Nauf al-Bakaali:

- He had labelled a recognized, senior Aalim of the Haqq as 'Enemy of Allah'.
- The difference of opinion was not related to Aqeedah nor to Fiqh. It pertained to a historical issue.
- He did not institute an investigation to establish if indeed Nauf had made the statement. He spontaneously without further enquiry, labelled Nauf '*Aduw wallaa*', merely on the basis of a statement made to him.
- Nauf was a great Aalim, Wali and the Imaam of the Ummah in Damascus.
- Not a single Aalim had criticized Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) for having administered this epithet of extreme gravity against a well-known authority of the Shariah.

- No one cited to Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) by way of admonition the Hadith: ‘To abuse a Muslim is *fisq*....’
- Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) was aware of the Hadith and of all the other Ahaadith and of the Qur’aanic Aayaat which instruct observance of *Rifq* (tenderness/kindness) when speaking. Despite his awareness of the *Uswah Hasanah* and methodology of *Rifq* of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he adopted Rasulullah’s methodology of *Ta’neef* since this, in his opinion, was the need for the occasion. In so doing, he emulated Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who had labelled a *mukhannath* (transvestite, hermaphrodite, moffie), ‘*Aduw-wallaah*’ because this person stared intently at women. No difference of Aqidah.
- The Ulama – the great Authorities of the Shariah - condone and justify these epithets of extreme gravity which are the effects of *Bughdh fillaah*, and also for the sake of protecting the Deen.

Epithets such as ‘*Enemy of Allah*’, ‘*Enemy of the Deen*’, etc. made by the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen, are not isolated or rare incidents. The Kutub of the Shariah are replete with such pejorative epithets blurted out by great Authorities of the Shariah. In pursuance of the attitude of *Bughdh fillaah*. But the *juhhaal* molvis of *soo*’ (evil), grossly deficient in Ilm-e-Deen, with limited access to the Kutub of the Shariah due to lack of academic *Isti’daad* (ability), but experts in the art of cut and paste jobs – information which they lap up from just any website such as the moron has perpetrated in this current job of defending the zindeeq

tablighi doctor, take umbrage and disgorge venom at those who stand up in defence of the Sunnah and the Deen. They should remember that their villainous vituperation is in actual fact designed for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but is taken with pride by the Ulama-e-Haqq who are the Shields of Rasulullah's honour and the guardians of the Deen (the Qur'aan and Sunnah).

Coming back to the Epithet of *Aduw Wallaah*', we proffer more edification for the jaahil student molvi and his *juhhaal* Asaatizah who have taught him audacity, *kitmaanul haqq* and *ta'weel baatil*. It is indeed lamentable that some of the teachers at the Darul Uloom whilst imparting *dars* engage in *gheebat* of 'opponents' (Ulama-e-Haqq), thereby polluting and corrupting the brains and hearts of the students. Some students of the Madaaris do communicate with us, seeking advice regarding issues which they understand are in conflict with the Shariah, e.g. an Ustaadh indulging in *gheebat*.

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (Radhiyallahu anhu) branding a man who had objected to the manner in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had distributed the spoils of war, said: "*Yaa Aduw wallaah!*" (*O Enemy of Allah!*). Whoever disparages any facet of the Sunnah is in fact *Aduw Wallaah*.

Hadhrat Umar Ibn Khatthaab (Radhiyallahu anhu) had appointed Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) as the governor of Bahrain. On his return to Madinah, he (Abu Hurairah) had brought with him considerable wealth. When Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) saw the wealth, he commented with extreme harshness: "*Ya Aduw Wallaah!*" (*O*

Enemy of Allah!), *Ya Aduw wa Kitaabihi!* (O Enemy of Allah's Kitaab –the Qur'aan!). You have stolen the wealth of Allah Ta'ala." Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) replied: "*O Ameerul Mu'mineen! I am not the enemy of Allah nor am I the enemy of His Kitaab. I have not stolen the wealth of Allah.*"

Despite Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) explaining how he had accumulated the wealth, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) paid no heed. He confiscated everything from Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) and entered it into the Baitul Maal.

This salubrious episode requires much reflection. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) was among the most senior Sahaabah. He was of the Ashaab-e-Suffah. He was about the greatest Narrator of Ahaadith. In every aspect of life he was impeccable. Despite all his credentials, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) without instituting any investigation – without making any enquiry – branded him an *enemy of Allah* and an *enemy of the Qur'aan*, and he confiscated all of the wealth Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) had brought with him.

Now will the *jaahil* student molvi apply the Ahaadith and the Qur'aanic Aayaat which deprecates such conduct? Shall it be said that Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was unaware of Rasulullah's methodology of *Rifq*? Shall it be said that he was in conflict with the Qur'aan which commands investigation before accusing and damning a person, especially if that person is a great Aalim, a Saint, a

Muhaddith and a close Sahaabi of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

What Aqeedah difference did Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) have with Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) to constrain him to resort to such a severe form of ‘naming and shaming’? The valid motive justifies the epithet of abuse, and the adoption of *ta’neef*.

Hadhrat Hasan Basri (Rahmatullah alayh), putting his life on the line, said to Hajjaaj, the brutal ruler of Iraq: *“O Worst of the Fussaaq! O Worst of the Fujjaar! The inhabitants of the heavens are wrathful to you. The inhabitants of the earth curse you”*.

Then when he left the palace of Hajjaaj, Hahrat Hasan commented: *“Verily, Allah has taken a pledge from the Ulama to proclaim the Haqq, and not to conceal it.”* All those ‘big big’ molvis who had condoned the disparagement and the denigration of the Sunnah, and the humiliation of the Brother who had upheld the Sunnah, should hang their heads in shame for their disgusting conduct of offering support to the zindeeq tablighi doctor who slandered the Sunnah, dishonoured Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with his satanic tirade, and humiliated the honour of the Brother.

Once when Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (Rahmatullah alayh) was severely criticizing a narrator, someone admonishing him said: *“O Shaikh! Do not make gheebat of the Ulama.”* Imaam Ahmad responded: *“O miserable one! This is naseehat, not gheebat.”*

When Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mubaarak (Rahmatullah alayh) had criticized a narrator, it was said to him: *“You have indulged in gheebat.”* He replied: *“Shut up! If we do not explain (i.e. expose the deviate), how will the Haqq be distinguished from baatil?”*

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mubaarak (Rahmatullah alayh) said: *“If I am given the choice of entering Jannat (first) or meeting Abdullah Bin Muharrar, I shall opt to first meet him, then enter Jannat. However, when I saw him, manure was more loved to me than he.”*

Even moron students are aware of the status of this Jalilul Qadr Taab’e, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mubaarak (Rahmatullah alayh). What was the need for him to refer Muharrar with such contempt? Ibn Muharrar at the lowest level was after all a Mu’min subscribing to Tauheed. He did not utter kufr. But it was said that the manure of camels was superior to him. Was Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mubaarak (Rahmatullah alayh) not aware of Rasulullah’s methodology of *Rifq bil Jaahil*? Was he not aware of the Hadith: *“Abusing a Muslim is fisq....”* Was he not aware of the innumerable Ahaadith and the many Qur’aanic Aayaat pertaining to good *Akhlaaq*? What is the verdict of this moron misguided student molvi?

Once when a man with dishevelled hair and beard came into the presence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he (Nabi –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Some of you come as if he is a shaitaan.”* This was said in the presence of the man. On another occasion Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasalam) saw a man with black hair. However, the day

before his hair was white. He had dyed his hair black. Rasulullah (Sallallahalayhi wsallam) said: “Who are you?” The man replied: “I am a certain person (i.e. he provided his name).” Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “In fact, you are shaitaan.” The methodology of *Rifq* was not adopted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The man was explicitly named a ‘shaitaan’.

Amr Bin Walid said: “I said to Abbaad Bin Mansur: ‘Who said to you that Ubay Bin Ka’b (Radhiyallahu anhu) had refuted Ibn Mas’ood (Radhiyallahu anhu) regarding the Hadith on Qadr?’ Abbaad Bin Mansur said: ‘A man whom I do not know.’ Amr Bin Walid said: “I know who he is. He is the Shaitaan.”

In *Tabaqaatul Hanaabilah*, it is said about these deviates: “A man who opposes the Haqq, and opposes the Muttaqeen before him, he is a deviate, a misguider, and a shaitaan in this Ummah. It is incumbent on one who recognizes him to warn people of him, and to expose his affair so that people do not fall into his bid’ah and be destroyed.” This in fact is applicable to the zindeeq tabligh doctor who opposed the Sunnah.

FOOD FOR THE MORON’S REFLECTION

Ibn Ishaq (Rahmatullah alayh) was among the illustrious Muhadditheen. However, two great authorities of the Shariah had diametrically opposite views regarding him. Shu’bah said about him: “Verily, he is Ameerul Mu’mineen in Hadith.” Shu’bah is an Imaam of the Shariah according to all authorities, and so is Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh).

However, Imaam Maalik severely assailing Ibn Ishaq said: “Verily he is a dajjaal from the dajaajilah.” The very Muhaddith who is Ameerul Mu’mineen fil Hadith to the one authority is a dajjaal to another authority. It was not a difference in Aqeedah.

Was Imaam Maalik (Rahmatulla alayh) not aware of the *Rifq* methodology of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? The miscreant student molvi should direct his admonition to Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh) for ‘naming and shaming’ a great Muhaddith whose honour has been ‘violated’ in terms of the moron’s ‘naming and shaming’ bunkum theory.

A LITANY OF PEJORATIVES

For the entertainment and edification of the moron who has eloped with the idea of him being a ‘mujtahid’, we present a ‘beautiful’ litany of epithets and pejoratives uttered with objugatory intent.

Shaitaan, Dajjaal, Son of Shaitaan, Dajjaal among the Dajaajilah, Aduw Wallaah (Enemy of Alah), Hadith Thief, Kath-thaab (Great Liar), Vile man, Shaikh Dajjaal, Fraud, Such a Shaikh Dajjaal whose mention in the Kutub is not halaal except by way of vilification, A greater liar than my donkey (i.e. a greater moron than my donkey), Kath-thaabun Khabeethun (Such a great liar who is Filth, Great Fabricator, Zindeeq, Faasiqun Mal-oonun (Accursed Faasiq), Wild Beast, Akthabun Naas (The Greatest liar of mankind), Ruknul Kithb (The Pillar of lies), All Lies end in him,

Mankind's Worst Liar, Ma'dinul Kithb (The Mine of Lies), Mamba-ul Kithb (Fountain of Lies), Son of a Seductor, Worse than Iblees, Manure is superior to him, Dhaal (deviate), Mudhil (one who deviates others), Faasiq minal Fussaaq (faasiq among the fussaaq), etc. All of these laudatory and complimentary designations were awarded to specific personalities – to great Ulama, Muhadditheen and Fuqaha. And, these epithets were coined by Ulama during the Salafus Saaliheen era.

All of these 'beautiful' pejorative artefacts apply with perfect equanimity to the *Zindeeq* who denigrated the Sunnah and humiliated the honour of a Muslim Brother. These are all designations and appellations beautifully carved by the Authorities of the Shariah, commencing from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and including the Sahaabah, Taabi'-een and Tab-e-Taabi'een. The Kutub of the Shariah are replete with these complimentary titles awarded by the Authorities of the Shariah to those whom they considered to be deviates and devils whilst in reality most of these castigated personalities who were named and shamed were great Aimmah and Auliya. But morons with squint-eyed vision have no meaningful access to the Kutub. Their research is restricted to cutting and pasting from generally the websites of liberals and self-appointed 'mujtahids' wallowing in *jahaalat*.

THE TAFSEER OF AAYAT 75, 76 AND 77, SURAH AT-TAUBAH

“And from them are those who pledge to Allah that if He (Allah) gives us from his bounty, then most certainly we shall give Sadqah and be among the Saaliheen. Then, when We give them from Our bounty, they become niggardly with it. They turn their backs (on their pledge), and they ignore(what they had promised Allah). Then He (Allah) established nifaaq in their hearts until the Day they will meet Him (in Qiyaamah), (and this is) because they violated what they had promised Allah, and because of the lies they spoke.

Scrounging the barrel (the internet websites) on account of lacking access to the Kutub of the Shariah due to lack of *Isti'daad* (academic ability), the misguided student molvi, in refutation of the official tafseer of the Jamhoor Mufasssireen, in fact, of all the Mufasssireen, and Fuqaha, disgorges what he had lapped up from the vomit of the website. Thus he says:

“This tahqiq is also worth studying: Question - “Is the famous incident about Sayyiduna Tha’labah Ibn Hatib (Radhiyallahu anhu) asking Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to make dua Allah Ta’ala increases his wealth and him not paying zakah after becoming wealthy authentic? Answer - Despite the narration being widely quoted, it is unauthentic and not suitable to quote. Hafiz Ibn Hajar and Hafiz Haythami (Rahimahumallahu) have classified the chain of narrators as very weak.....”

The ‘*tahqiq*’, i.e. research, to which the *jaahil* refers, is not his own *tahqiq*. He merely lapped up the deficient ‘*tahqiq*’ from a website, and presented it as his own. If this

unfortunate defender of the zindeeq tablighi anti-Sunnah doctor, had valid academic ability in the Knowledge of the Shariah, he would not have swept the sites for cast away cigarette butts and stubs, but would have honourably resorted to the Kutub. Then he would not have failed to acquire the correct tafseer of these Aayaat proffered by the Jamhooir Mufasssireen. He would not have committed the stupid blunder of dismissing the authoritative Tafseer of the Jamhooir on the basis of his own misunderstanding the statements of Ibn Hajar and others.

The episode in discussion in the aforementioned Aayaat of the Qur'aan Majeed refers to Tha'labah Bin Haatib who had requested Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to supplicate for barkat in his wealth. Although Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) discouraged him from this desire, he persisted. Thereafter, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) made dua. The consequence of this dua was the increase of Thalabah's weath by leaps and bounds. When it was time to pay the Zakaat on the fortune he had amassed, he refused. Thus, the curse of Allah Ta'ala in the form of *nifaaq* was grounded in his heart. After his initial refusal when he attemptd to pay the Zakaat, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the three Khulafa Raashideen rejected his Zakaat. He died during the khilaafat of Sayyiduna Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) with his Zakaat undischarged.

The Mufasssireen named Tha'labah Bin Haatib as the person who had reneged on his pledge. Among the authoritative Kutub of Tafseer which unanimously confirm that the person mentioned in these Qur'aanic Aayaat was Tha'labah, are:

- (1) Tafseer Tabari (d 310 H)
- (2) Tafseer Ibn Abi Haatim (d 327 H)
- (3) Tafseer Maturidi (d 333 H).
- (4) Tafseer Abu Laith Samarqandi (d 373 H)
- (5) Tafseer Ath-Tha'labi (d 427 H).
- (6) Tafseer Al-Hidaayah Ila Bulughin Nihaayah of Abu Muhammad Maaliki (d 437)
- (7) Tafseer Maawardi Ash-Shaafi (450 H)
- (8) Tafseerul Waahidi Ash-Shaafi (d 468 H)
- (9) Tafseer Jurjaani (d 471 H)
- (10) Tafseerus Sam'aani Ash-Shaafi (d 459 H)
- (11) Tafseerul Baghawi Ash-Shaafi (d 510)
- (12) Tafseer Al-Muharrarul Wajeez by Allaamah Muhaaribi (d 542 H)
- (13) Tafseer I'jaazul Bayaan by Najmuddeen Nishapuri (d 550 H)
- (14) Tafseer Ibnul Jauzi Al-Hambali (d 597 H)
- (15) Tafseerur Raazi (d 606 H)
- (16) Tafseer Qur'aan by Izzud Deen Al-Dimishqi (d 660 H)
- (17) Tafseerul Qurtubi (d 671H)
- (18) Tafseer Baidhaawi (d 685H)
- (19) Tafseer Nasafi Al-Hanafi (d 710 H)
- (20) Tafseer Khaazin Al-Hanafi (d 741H)
- (21) Tafseer At-Tas-heel li Ulumit Tanzeel by Abul Qaasim Al-Gharnaati (d 741 H)
- (22) Tafseer Al-Bahrul Muheet of Abu Hayyaan Al-Andulusi (d 745 H)
- (23) Tafseer Ibn Katheer (d 774 H)
- (24) Tafseer Lubaab by Umar Bin Ali Al-Hambali (d 775 H)

- (25) Tafseer Gharaaibul Qur'aan by Nizaamuddin Nishapuri (d 850 H)
- (26) Tafseer Jalaalain of Imaam Suyuti (d 911 H)
- (27) Tafseer Al-Jawaahurul Hisaan of Abu Zaid Ibn Makhloof (d 875 H)
- (28) Nazmud Durar of Al-Baqqaa'i (d 885 H)
- (29) Tafseerul Ijee Ash-Shaafi (905 H)
- (30) Tafseer Ad-Durrul Manthur Of Imaam Suyuti (d 911 H)
- (31) Tafseer As-Siraajul Muneer of Shamsuddeen Ash-Shirbeeni Ash-Shaafi (d 877)
- (32) Roohul Ma-aani of Shihaabuddeen Aaloosi (d 1270 H)
- (33) Fathul Qadeer of Muhammad Ash-Shaukaani Al-Yemeni (d 1275 H)
- (34) Fathul Bayaan Fi Maqaasidil Qur'aan of Al-Husaini Al-Bukhaari Al-Qinnaaji (d 1270 H)
- (35) Tafseer Mazhari (d.1225 H)
- (36) Tafseer Bayaaul Qur'aan of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (d.1362 H)
- (37) Ma-aariful Qur'aan of Mufti Muhammad Shafi (d.1396 H)
- (38) Tafseeru Al-Bahrul Madeed of Abu Abbaas Al-Faasi (d 1224 H)
- (39) Tafseer Utmaani of Moulana Shabbi Ahmed Uthmaani (d 1369 H)
- (40) Tafseerul Manaar of Shaikh Rashid Ridha (d 1354 H)

Besides this staggering array of Kutub of the illustrious Mufasssireen, there are more Tafseer Kutub confirming the

very same person, viz. Tha'labah Bin Haatib, as being the subject of reference in the relevant Qur'aanic verses. In the aforementioned enumeration are included even the tafseers of liberals, ghair muqallids and salafis.

This digression has been constrained by the stupidity of the moron paper 'mujtahid'. Whoever the person castigated in the Aayat may be, has no relevance to the topic of naming and shaming. Relative to this discussion, it matters not who the person was. The fact remains that the culprit is named and shamed. Since the moron has no ability for *tahqiq* (research) he simply lapped up from the internet just any flotsam with which to fill some pages to gratify his ego with the hallucination of being a 'mujtahid'. If he had gained access to the Kutub, he would have understood that it is not possible for such a glittering galaxy of illustrious Ulama and Mufasssireen to all have committed the same blunder which he as assumed on the basis of what he has acquired from the website.

If the moron is capable of understanding that the Tha'labah mentioned as a munaafiq was not among the munaafiqeen because he was from the People of Badr, then did all the great Giants of Uloom not understand this issue. It is confirmed that there were two people with almost identical names. There is no incumbency to believe that the Tha'labah who comes within the purview of the Qur'aanic Aayat was from the People of Badr. Several Mufasssireen have also clarified this issue. In fact, there is no need for clarification since it is only a moron who seeks proof for the presence of the sun during day time. That the Tha'laba referred to in the Qur'aanic Aayat was not the Badri, is a self-evident fact.

Mentioning this obvious fact, Allaamah Aaloosi (Rahmatullah alayh) states in his *Ruhul Ma-aani*: “*The Aayat was revealed regarding Tha’labah Bin Haatib. He is mentioned as Ibn Abi Haatib. He is from Bani Umayya Bin Zaid, and he is not the Badri (Tha’labah) because he (the Badri) was martyred in Uhud –Radhiyallahu anhu.*” Other Mufasssireen also mention this fact to dispel the confusion.

In the array of Tafaaseer Kutub mentioned above, some mention the confusion. In reality the doubts pale into oblivion because the contention is not that the Tha’labah whom the Qur’aan confirms as a munaafiq, was the same Tha’labah who had participated in the Battle of Badr. This issue introduced stupidly by the moron is nonsensical. We have digressed and we have entertained this drivell introduction simply to show that the fellow is a moron having very little relationship with Ilm-e-Deen.

Although we had at no stage mentioned the naming practice of the Mufasssireen as the basis for our justified Shar’i practice of naming Zindeeqs and Mudhilleen, the moron shot himself in the foot by having introduced extraneous matter. All the extraneous issues confirm our stance of naming. Naming is the standard practice of all the Mufasssireen and Muhadditheen. As for the ‘shaming’ component of the stupid theory, it is simply a necessary corollary stemming from the naming regardless of there being no intent.

Furthermore, the topic of discussion is not the identity of the person to whom reference is made in the Aayat. The argument concerns the theory of naming and shaming. Hence,

regardless of who the person was, the fact remains that he was named. This amount suffices for our stance. Now whether the Tha'labah mentioned by almost every Mufassir is the one of Badr or not, is not relevant to our discussion in this treatise. Nevertheless, we had deemed the digression necessary to divest the fellow of his stance of *jahaalat*.

DON'T BE LIKE A PANTING DOG

“His similitude is like that of a dog. If you attack it, it (the dog) pants, or if you leave it, it (also) pants.

This is the example of people who belie Our Aayaat.”

(A'raaf, Aayat 176)

The moron molvi should have some awareness of the circumstance of revelation of this Aayat which refers to the episode of Bal'am Ba-oor, a famous saint (buzrug) of Bani Israaeel. He was Mustajaabut Da'waat, i.e. his duas were instantaneously accepted by Allah Ta'ala. He fell into the snare of shaitaan who had used his wife to entangle him in kufr.

Nabi Yoosha' (Alayhis salaam) was set to invade with his army the land where Bal'am Ba-oor lived. The ruler prevailed on his wife to persuade her husband Bal'am to make dua for the defeat of the army of Bani Israaeel. At first, Bal'am Ba-oor vigorously refused. But in the end the pleadings and nagging of his wife, and the huge amount of wealth given to bribe her blinded his intellect.

When he attempted to make dua against the army of Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam), his mouth simply locked. After the

third attempt, his mouth opened and his tongue miraculously hung out like a dog. It was stuck to his chest, leaving him panting like a dog.

He had become the agent of Iblees, hence his earthly punishment was panting like a dog with tongue on his chest at all times. He had attempted to use the Deen against the Nabi of Allah Ta'ala. The bounty of *Istijaab* (acceptance of dua) is an element of the Deen. Nabi Yoosha's Jihad was an element of the Deen. This dog of a person – the agent of Iblees – whose brains became convoluted by worldly / nafsani motives, abortively attempted to use the Deen against the Deen. He miserably failed and ended up like a dog panting at all times in all circumstances whether tired or not.

We warn the student molvi that by defending the Zindeeq who denigrated the Sunnah, he is playing with fire and hanging his Imaan on the line of destruction even though he is too blind to perceive the misfortune on which he has embarked. By using the Qur'aan and Ahaadith to defend a Zindeeq he has likened himself to Bal-am Ba-oor. He has become like a panting dog. He disgorges the Qur'aan and Ahaadith against the Deen. He thus pants like a dog – like Bal-am Ba-oor after he fell from his lofty pedestal of Wilaayat just as shaitaan had fallen from his lofty pedestal in the Heavens.

The molvi should reflect on the statements of kufr made by the miserable tablighi doctor, then in that mirror of *zanaadaqah*, should he view his defence of the Zindeeq. May

Allah Ta'ala guide him and us all, and save us all from the evil lurking in our nafs and from the snares of Iblees.

DON'T BE LIKE A DONKEY

“The similitude of those on whom the Tauraah was loaded, then they did not carry it, is like the similitude of a donkey carrying kitaabs. Vile indeed is the example of such people who belie the Aayaat of Allah. And Allah does not guide those who are flagrantly unjust.”
(Al-Jumuah, Aayat 5)

Neither does a donkey understand nor appreciate the treasure of Kutub loaded on its back. Casting saffron in front of a donkey is stupid. The donkey will not appreciate it. This is the similitude of molvis who have acquired the Kutub of the Deen, which remain closed books to them. Whilst they have studied something of the Deen and have acquired possession of the Kutub, they are like a donkey which does not understand the load of Kutub on its back.

About such molvis and Asaatizah, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“He who imparts Ilm to one who is unfit for it, is like one who garlands swines with diamonds, pearls and gold.”

Just as the swines and the donkeys do not understand the worth of the treasures with which they are garlanded, and the Kutub loaded on to them respectively, so is it with the molvis who misuse the smattering of knowledge which they glean from the internet, using it for the destruction of the Deen, for the denigration of the Sunnah and for humiliating the honour of those who uphold the Sunnah and the Shariah.

We urge the student molvi to engage in some *muraaqabah* to detect the shaitaani thief lurking within the innermost recess of his heart, and to save his Imaan which he has hung on the line in defence of the *zindeeq* who had insulted the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

If he ponders, he will not fail to understand that the only reason for his shaitaani defence of the *mujrim (criminal)* is the common factor of being Tablighis. Both the doctor character and this molvi character are blind Tablighis. They have elevated the Tabligh Jamaat above the Sunnah and the Shariah. Such bigotry is the effect of pride and vanity (*takabbur and ujub*).

A WORD OF NASEEHAT FOR THE DARUL ULOOM ASAATIZAH

Only such Ulama who have opted for deliberate blindness will fail to see and understand the deplorable academic and moral conditions and diseases in which both the Asaatizah and the Talaba are wallowing. The attitude of this moron molvi has been largely influenced and moulded by the corruption of the Asaatizah. Reference to this has already been made in the introduction of this treatise.

It is imperative to set aside *ujub and takabbur* and to acknowledge the putrid condition of the Talaba of the Madaaris. In addition to their corrupt moral state, they are academically sub-doldrum. They lack egregiously in *Is'tidaad*. A fundamental cause for this gross weakness, besides, the lack of *Islaah*, is the addiction to the computer. It

is indeed a lamentable *khiyaanat* perpetrated by the Madaaris by allowing the students access to computers. This addiction has closed access to the Kutub. The Talaba should incumbently do their *Mutaala-ah* via the Kutub, not lap up the vomit on the *napaak* internet.

The consequence of computer addiction is closure of the Avenue of direct access to the Kutub. The Talaba of today hence lack the ability to gain a panoptical view of a subject which is tackled. Their information is limited to the cigarette butts and stubs they pick up on the internet, and generally cast by deviates. Thus, we observe only cut and paste jobs presented by the molvis of this computer era. Then they have the audacity to pat themselves on the back, hallucinating of having achieved great accomplishment in the field of Shar'i Uloom when in reality they are still crawling at kindergarten level. This unfortunate student molvi is an example of a kindergarten infant trying to jump to the top of a ladder.

Our tone and methodology will be chagrin to those whose egos are bloated with nafsaniyat, but we proffer this advice with sincerity for the enduring benefit of the Ahl-e-Ilm. Heed our advice. Ban computers in the Madaaris for the Talaba. Get them to cultivate affinity (*Munaasabat*) with the Kutub. During our Madrasah days we were not allowed to study even the *Shuruhaat*. This prohibition was underlined by sound wisdom. Let them convert the nights into day with absorption in the Kutub. Let them understand that their final year at the Madrasah does not qualify them as 'Aalims'. They only qualify to understand with clarity their own *jahaalat* which they have to hencefort treat with perpetual

engrossment with the Kutub. No genuine Taalib-e-Ilm ever qualified as an *Aalim* simply because he had done a stint at a Madrasah.

It is indeed sad that the Asaatizah fail to understand the harms of the computer for the Talaba. The talks of benefits of the computer for the Deeni Student is a lot of kuffaar twaddle. The Brain cells atrophy when they are frozen by leaning on the computer crutch. The Talaba will not gain proper *Isti'daad* if the computer replaces the Kutub. It is for this reason they are reliant on computer disgorgement. They lack the academic *Isti'daad* and the spiritual stamina (*Roohaaniyat*) for both research and comprehension.

We also urge the Madaaris to get rid of the kuffaar sportfields which pollute the Madrasah environment and ruin the Akhlaaq of the Students. Students wearing Bermuda pants and T-shirts! What type of 'ulama' will this material make? Have mercy on the Talaba and the community at large whom the Molvis are supposed to guide, not misguide. Misguidance has become the profession of the molvis of this era. Was-salaam

SUMMARY

1. An elder of the Tableeghi Jamaat, at a walimah, denigrated the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He was averse to a Brother sitting on the floor eating in Sunnah

style. He disparaged and insulted the Brother in the presence of the crowd eating from tables in kuffaar style.

2. Several Molvis present, all eating from tables, remained silent spectators to the denigration of the Sunnah and the humiliation of the Brother by the Tablighi elder.

3. The Brother complained to us about the vile treatment of the Tablighi elder.

4. We published his complaint, our comment and naseehat.

5. A molvi student, also a Tablighi, wrote an article in defence of the Tablighi elder. In his article he stupidly and abortively struggled to show that it is not permissible to name a zindeeq, deviate, etc.

6. The student molvi attempted to show that in Rasulullah's methodology of Naseehat there was only *Rifq* (tenderness) and no *Ta'neef* (severity/harshness).

7. He also attempted to show that epithets which shame the culprits were not used in the methodology of the Sunnah nor by the Ulama.

8. In refutation of the bunkum arguments presented by the *jaahil* student molvi, we have, by Allah's *fadh*l proffered this refutation as *naseehat* for those who heed *naseehat*.

***“Take lesson, O People of Intelligence!”
(Qur’aan)***

NAMING THE AHL BID'AH AND DHALAAL

Some Brothers wrote:

Respected Ulama at the Majlis

Your article on the Tabligh Jamaat elder abandoning and in fact belittling the Sunnah of sitting on the ground when eating was distributed by a brother mentioning the name of the Jamaat senior. An upstart Molvi with ties to the Jamaat took umbrage at the mention of the name of the guilty person. He says that the name should not be mentioned as this was not the way of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His response is reproduced verbatim hereunder.

We would like to know the comments of the Ulama at the Majlis. Should the names of the perpetrators of bid'ah and dhalaal be mentioned or concealed?

Was-Salaam

Concerned Brothers

Assalamualaykum warahmatullahi wabarakatuhu

When Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wasallam would mention the wrongs of people, he would do so by not mentioning the names.

You'll see in the hadith

ما بال اقوام ... ما بال الناس Etc

Rasulullah Sallallahu alayhi wasallam only disclosed the names of the Munafiqeen to Sayyiduna Hudhaifah Radhiyallahu anhu. In this is a great lesson for us.

المؤمن مرآة المؤمن

So I feel it more appropriate NOT to spread these messages with the name of the brother. Rather make it anonymous.

و من ستر عن مسلم ستره الله فى الدنيا و الآخرة

Our Response:

The anti-Sunnah act was committed flagrantly in public. It was a flagrant sin executed shamelessly, and it was an organized sin for which there was not a vestige of remorse in the heart. On the contrary, the Tablighi doctor justified his haraam, anti-Sunnah act. He was thus a source of misguidance. And worse than his abandonment of the Sunnah, was his belittling of the Sunnah which is tantamount to kufr.

The molvi is ignorant and short-sighted. If he does a bit of more mutaa-la-ah, he will discover the need to publicly name persons who mislead Muslims by justifying publicly their misdemeanours. Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh)

has in fact stated explicitly that the miscreant of misguidance must be named publicly.

The molvi has been swift to cite an example of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but he took no umbrage when the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was being publicly discarded and rudely immolated. The attitude of the doctor towards the brother sitting on the floor, portrays the hidden kufr deep in his heart, hence he was prepared to fight with an upholder of the Sunnah because the brother was firm in observing the Sunnah. The brother did not dispute with the miscreant tablighi doctor. On the contrary, the miscreant picked a fight with the brother who maintained silence and was humiliated.

Advise the miscreant molvi to ask the miscreant doctor why he had publicly disgraced the brother. Was that action of publicly disgracing the brother Sunnah while sitting and eating on the ground was not Sunnah? The molvi has his facts upside down because his brains are operating in reverse gear.

It is only Iblees who is tricking the miscreants and adorning deception for them.

Was-salaam

TABLES AND CHAIRS

Question: I read your articles against sitting on chairs and eating from tables. What is your response to the attached Fatwa of a senior Mufti?

THE FATWA

The answer to your query is as follows:

It is permissible to eat on a table and chair as there is no severity in Shariah regarding such Masaail. But one must remember not to lean on the chair whilst eating; rather he must bend towards the food. However to eat whilst sitting on the floor is from the Sunnats of the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, one must try and follow the Sunnah and eat whilst sitting on the floor.

There are various narrations from Hadhrat Anas RA which show that Nabi ﷺ used to eat on the floor. However, we didn't come across any narration where Nabi ﷺ forbid eating on tables and chairs. Therefore, it is permissible to eat on them. Furthermore, Hadhrat Anas RA had a table which he used for this purpose which also shows the permissibility of eating on it. In Ibn Maja it has been narrated:

حدثنا قتادة، قال: كنا نأتي أنس بن مالك - قال إسحاق: وخبازه وخوانه موضوع - فقال يوما: «كلوا فما أعلم: قائم، وقال الدارمي

رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، رأى رغيفا مرققا، بعينه، حتى
(لحق بالله ولا شاة سميطا، قط)» (ابن ماجة رقم ٣٣٣٩)

Some of our Elderly Ulama forbid eating on a table because of imitation with non-Muslims. Regarding this topic Moulana Thanwi RA mentions that when a thing becomes common amongst the Muslims and it is not done out of pride and arrogance then it is not counted as imitation with non-Muslims. (Imdadul- Fatawa 4/267)

Mufti Mahmood Saheb RA mentions that eating on a table is against the Sunnah. Further on he says that in a place where eating on a table is a distinguishing characteristic of the non-Muslims and the Fussaqa it is forbidden to eat on it. But if it becomes so common amongst Muslims that the pious also adopt this way then the ruling will not be so severe. However, it will be against the Sunnah. (Fatawa Mahmoodiya 18/79)

The amazing thing is that people question regarding eating on a table while they do not follow the way of the Sahaba in writing whilst sitting?

When they don't question this action due to the permissibility of it then why do they question eating on the table when it is also permissible?

(End of fatwa)

THE RESPONSE

The incongruencies of the Mufti's fatwa are as follows:

(1) He concedes that sitting on the floor is Rasulullah's Sunnah, yet he states that "there is no severity" in this matter. But the Fuqaha say: "*Miswaak is Sunnah. Denying it is kufr.*" The lackadaisical attitude of the Mufti to the Sunnah can lead to kufr. Almost all modernists deny and even despise eating on the floor. This is an issue of severity.

(2) Not having come across any narrations is not a daleel. It is a drivel argument. There are no narrations pertaining to wearing bermuda pants or facebook or television or for any of the other multitude acts of haraam. There are Qur'aanic and Hadith principles on which the Fataawa are based. A 'fatwa' stemming from personal opinion such as the view of the Mufti Sahib is corrupt and devoid of Shar'i substance. A personal view unsubstantiated by either a direct mas'alah or a valid Shar'i principle, has no validity in terms of the Shariah. It does not have the weight and force of the Shariah. The Mufti Sahib simply does not know what he is speaking.

If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not specifically state that eating from tables is not permissible, it is only corrupt logic to aver that this abstention signifies permissibility. The principle is the *Uswah Hasanah (Beautiful Pattern of Life)* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In several Aayaat, the Qur'aan Majeed commands adoption of this gracious *Uswah*. Says Allah Ta'ala:

“Verily, for you in the Rasool of Allah is a beautiful pattern of life for him who has hope in (the meeting of) Allah and the Last Day, and who engages abundantly in the Thikr of Allah.”

This is the general principle. Add to it the principle of *Tashabbuh Bil Kuffaar* (emulating the kuffaar). Then view it in the light of the permanent 1400 years of the Ummah’s practice, especially of the Sahaabah, Taabieen, Tab-e-Taabieen, Auliya, etc. Then see what all the Akaabireen had to say on this issue, and what was their *amal*.

Surely the Mufti Sahib is aware or should be aware of the principle that if even a Sunnat act becomes a salient feature of the people of Bid’ah, then such Sunnat act shall be abstained from. Now what does intelligence dictate regarding an act which is glaringly among the ways and styles of the kuffaar?’

A Sahaabi said: “I was walking with a shawl on me. I was dragging it (because it was hanging on the ground). A man from behind exclaimed: *“Raise your garment, for verily it is purer and more lasting.”* I looked and saw that it was Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). I said: “O Rasulullah! It is an old shawl.” Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) responded: “What is there in me not (an ample) Uswah (way of life)?” Then I looked, and I saw that his izaar was midway on the calf.”

Here Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) veered away from logical argument. He only drew attention to his style to

impress the incumbency of adopting it. The issue of *Sunnat-e-Aaadiyah* may not be raised to confuse the issue. This example here emphasizes the incumbency of the Sunnah dress-style pertaining to wearing the trousers above the ankles. Similarly, eating on the floor is not an optional act to be classified as *Sunnat-e-Aaadiyah* which is optional. The weight of the evidence provided by all authorities of the Shariah leave no room for any interpretation to detract from the incumbency of eating on the floor and the prohibition of eating like the kuffaar from tables.

The *Mash-hoor* Hadith clearly states that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) never ate from a table. The Mufti Sahib attempts to create a concoction with technicalities by saying that the ‘*khwaan*’ negated in the Hadith has different meanings. The fact remains that in the context of the *Mash-hoor* Hadith it refers to nothing but a table. Thus Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“The meaning of this khwaan [i.e. the one on which Rasulullah –(Salallahu alayhi wasallam)– ate] is not the same as the one which is negated in the Mash-hoor Hadith in which it is said: “Never did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) eat on a khwaan”. On the contrary that khwaan (which is negated) is something like a table”

(3) Never once did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the Sahaabah or the Ambiya or the Auliya or the Fuqaha or the vast majority of the Ummah ever eat like kuffaar from tables. However, this Mufti Sahib is notorious for mangling narrations, confusing narrations and misinterpreting

narrations. He even attempts to conceal narrations. In the past we have pointed out this fact on other masaa-il.

(4) Regarding the citation from Hadhrat Thanvi's *Imdaadul Fataawa*, Vol.4, page 267, the Mufti Sahib is guilty of chicanery or gross *jahaalat*. He has a flair for misinterpretation, and taking issues out of context, and joining a piece of one narration with another piece to fabricate a fatwa to suit his whimsical opinion.

Firstly, the fatwa on page 264 or Volume 4 mentioned by the Mufti Sahib has absolutely no relevance to eating on the floor. It pertains to an entirely different issue. It pertains to dress, and even in his fatwa on this issue of dress style in England, Hadhrat Thanvi expresses doubt, hence he says: *"In this matter, I have understood this...."* He does not discuss the question of eating on the floor.

However, just two pages before this citation of the Mufti Sahib, Hadhrat Thanvi states on page 265, Volume 4:

"Eating from tables and chairs on account of Tashabbuh is prohibited. Furthermore, there is no pressing need for it."

Now please write to the Mufti and point out the above statement of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh). Also ask him: Why did Mufti Sahib not cite this fatwa of prohibition stated by Hadhrat Thanvi just two pages before the fatwa pertaining to dress on page 287 when it has a direct relevance to the topic under discussion? Why conceal what Hadhrat Thanvi said regarding eating

from tables? And why attempt to cloud the issue with a statement unrelated to the topic, but ignore the actual fatwa of prohibition stated by hadhrat Thanvi?

(5) In his *Malfoothaat*, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) says:

In view of the factors of *iftikhaar* (pride) and *tashabbuh* (emulating the kuffaar), eating from tables is prohibited. Irrespective of whatever interpretation or argument is presented to justify eating from tables, the actual reason for this (style of eating) is *tashabbuh* (i.e. imitating the kuffaar). While the conscience of people (i.e. of those who have not lost their souls to modernity and kufr culture) bothers them, they nevertheless, onerously endeavour to make this practice lawful.

(6) Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (Rahmatullah alayh) confirms that eating on the floor is Sunnah, and he adds that eating from tables is in *opposition to the Sunnah*. We therefore differ with the opinion that eating from tables is of “*lesser severity*”. This opinion being in opposition to the Sunnah is ludicrous and bereft of Shar’i substance.

Regarding the act of the ‘pious’, the honourable Mufti Mahmood Sahib has erred in his judgment because the Saaliheen do not eat from tables and chairs. Those who appear outwardly ‘pious’ such as molvis and tablighis, are not Saaliheen. We do not understand the watered down conception of ‘saaliheen’. The Saaliheen never tolerate conflict with the Sunnah. If these superficial ‘saaliheen’ eat

from tables, the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) may not be swept under the carpet, discarded and abrogated for the misdemeanour of the cardboard ‘saaliheen’. If they are genuine Saaliheen, they would be ashamed of themselves for violating the permanent Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by adopting the system of the kuffaar.

Furthermore, Mufti Mahmood (Rahmatullah alayh) does not say that “it is permissible” if the ‘saaliheen’ have also adopted this kuffaar practice. He says that the ‘severity’ is somewhat watered down. In other words, the severity of the opposition to the Sunnah is watered down. But in this opinion, the honourable Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (Rahmatullah alayh) has erred. It is not permissible to make Taqleed of the errors of the seniors. There is no scope for permissibility in the somewhat ambiguous fatwa of Mufti Mahmood Sahib.

(7) The irrefutable fact remains that eating from table and chairs is the system of the kuffaar, fussaag and fujjaar. It is not the system of Islam. The Saaliheen do not adopt kuffaar systems in preference to the Sunnah. Such a misdemeanour is not the *amal* of genuine Saaliheen. It is vile in the extreme for a Mufti to issue a fatwa which encourages people to gravitate away from the Sunnah. There is no problem for Muslims to abandon the kuffaar system and to adopt the Sunnah system. This is not a practice which Muslims are compelled to abandon due to external circumstances. It is a practice for observance withing the precincts of the home. What problem other than nafsaniyat and shaitaniyat is there

to debar Muslims from adopting this Sunnah, reviving this Sunnah, and gaining the immense rewards promised for the revival of a forgotten or discarded Sunnah? So why does this Mufti Sahib mangle fatwas and distort narrations, and conceal fatwas to assign permissibility and respectability to a practice of the kuffaar. This is *Istikhfaaf* which is a dangerous state.

(8) The averment that it is *“amazing that people do not question the way of the Sahaba in writing whilst sitting”*, is puerile drivel. The Mufti Sahib lacks the ability to constructively apply his mind to distinguish between different acts. If he had devoted a few extra minutes when he extracted an irrelevant from *Imdaadul Fataawa* of Hadhrat Thanvi, from page 287, Vol.4, and which he despicably misused, he would have obtained the answer to sitting and writing from desks/tables, and he would have understood the difference.

Explaining the difference between eating from tables and writing from tables, Hadhrat Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) states on page 286, Vol 4:

“While there is no uthr (excuse) for eating from tables and chairs, (there is uthr) regarding office work...Practically (qaanoon amali) there is a majboori (a valid excuse, i.e. for writing from desks/tables), hence the one may not be analogized on the basis of the other.”

In other words, writing may not be based on eating. The rulings differ.

And, even if we did not have Hadhrat Thanvi's fatwa, common sense is adequate to highlight the difference. Practically in our environment, sitting on the floor writing, typing, etc. all day long is too tedious a task, even at home for those who have been sitting on chairs and writing from desks since childhood. In the public domain, it is well nigh impossible. The Mufti Sahib has acquitted himself very childishly on this issue. The difference with eating is glaring, and the Mufti Sahib's abortive analogy is fallacious.

(9) Let us momentarily assume that writing sitting on the floor and not from desks/tables is also necessary in terms of the Sunnah, then at most it could be argued that we are being selective because of the difference in our stance pertaining to the two acts. But, abrogating a Sunnah is not permissible on the basis of laxity on another Sunnah. Thus, if Zaid consumes wine, he may not be faulted for saying drugs are haraam, zina is haraam, carrion is haraam, etc. He may not be criticized for saying that eating on the ground is Sunnah. He may not be taunted: First attend to your wine drinking, then speak about the Sunnah. In effect, this is the stupid taunt of the Mufti Sahib.

(10) His statement: *"...why do they question eating on the table when it is also permissible?"* is drivel. We state categorically that eating from table is NOT permissible, and writing from tables IS permissible. The Mufti Sahib's question is devoid of Shar'i substance.

He has failed to present even a weak argument to bolster his permissibility view. It is a great defect in a Mufti to issue

fatwas to cover up his own weaknesses. If a Mufti eats from tables, he should still fear Allah Ta'ala when issuing fatwas. He should not compromise the Sunnah to vindicate his own weakness of eating from tables.

May Allah Ta'ala save us from the evil lurking in our nafs and from Talbees-e-Iblees (Deception of Iblees).